14563

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
An Introduction to Concepts and Theories

Public Administration
An Introduction to Concept and Theories

RUMKI BASU

350
B299P

Public Administration
An Introduction to Concepts and Theories

To
my parents
for
their continuing support and guidance

PREFACE

The present reformulation of undergraduate course in Public Administration by the University of Delhi has inspired me to write this book. The syllabi of Public Administration in most Indian universities stress the formal institutions of government, and structure of administration, making the subject too legalistic and descriptive. Administrative and institutional behaviour and processes have been either completely ignored or under-emphasized in the teaching of the subject. It is small wonder, therefore, that teachers often find it difficult to create or sustain the interest of students in this paper, which compared to other papers in Political Science appears rather dry and boring. Besides, the syllabi in most universities failed to incorporate the latest worldwide developments in the theory and practice of the growing discipline of public administration. The entire study of public administration was restricted to the teaching of the administrative institutions of India and the Western world mainly the UK and the USA.

Therefore, a revision of existing courses to bring them in tune with continuing developments in the discipline and also to shift the old perspective of teaching Public Administration seemed imperative. Delhi University's effort at pioneering this course reformulation in the existing circumstances was a bold attempt and is to be welcomed, as a step in the right direction. The new course in the University incorporates all the new developments in the discipline and supplements the study of Western administrative systems with that of others. The Indian administrative system has now to be studied from a Third World perspective. Study of the administrative systems of the Soviet Union and China have also been included with special attention to their specific characteristics which distinguish them from Western models of administration. The new course is a blend of the old and the new, study of the structure of administration as well as its processes and behavioural aspects.

The book has been written to cater to the academic requirements of undergraduate students, to give them not merely a preliminary understanding of the subject, but to enable them to cultivate a deeper interest in the vast and growing literature on Public Administration. I would consider my effort worthwhile and rewarding if I can make my student-readers, for whom the book is primarily intended, realize that Public Administration is not just

a storehouse of dry facts but is an all prevasive affair, a continuous ongoing process of action and interaction between each one of us and the environment in which we live. Public Administration not only ensures the daily life of the individual and the community to run smoothly, it is much more, in developing societies, like ours ; it is an essential instrument of social change, economic progress and human welfare. I have given ample examples from the Indian situation in every chapter of the book to enhance the students' comprehension and understanding.

While my debts, both general and specific, are many in a venture of this sort, I accept the sole responsibility for any errors of fact or interpretation that might have inadvertently, crept into the first edition of this book. I would welcome suggestions from every quarter, specially from students and colleagues for improving the book in subsequent editions.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. (Mrs.) Sita Srivastava, Principal, Maitreyi College, for giving every possible help to enable me to prepare extensive teaching material for my students. I have gained immensely from continuous discussions with my colleague, Mrs. Vimla Dutta, who collaborated with me at every stage in the initial teaching of this course in the College. It was while preparing teaching material for this new course that the idea of writing this book was born.

My thanks are also due to Prof. R.B. Jain, Prof. Manoranjan Mohanty and Dr. (Mrs.) Noorjahan Bava of the Department of Political Science (University of Delhi), for their lectures on selected aspects of the new course to those who were teaching the paper and I am also indebted to Prof. M.P. Singh and Prof. (Mrs.) Susheela Kaushik of the Political Science Department, Delhi University, for their help and active encouragement which was a great source of inspiration for getting this book published.

I have benefited a lot from discussions with colleagues teaching this paper at Janki Devi College and also teachers of Public Administration elsewhere. It would be impossible to record my thanks to all of them individually. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. S.K. Ghai, Managing Director, Sterling Publishers, who has been primarily responsible for getting this book published in the shortest possible time.

I would like to thank Mr. B.L. Vohra for his cooperation in prompt and excellent typing of the entire manuscript. I am also grateful to the Library staff of the Indian Institute of Public Administration for their help and assistance.

In the end, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my husband Dr. Sankar Basu, for with his constant support, endurance and encouragement the book was finally written.

RUMKI BASU

CONTENTS

1

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
A DISCIPLINE AND A PROFESSION

Meaning and Scope

Public administration is the management of affairs of the government at all levels national, state and local. It is a branch of the wider field of administration. The term administration has been variously defined by different writers. In the words of Marx[1] "Administration is determined action taken in pursuit of a conscious purpose. It is the systematic ordering of affairs and the calculated use of resources aimed at making those things happen which one wants to happen". According to J.M Pfiffner, "Administration is the organization and direction of human and material resources to achieve desired ends".[2] Therefore, the two essentials of administration are : (i) cooperative effort, and (ii) pursuit of common objectives.

Public administration is any kind of administration in the public interest which, in other words, has simply come to mean governmental administration. Administration of private enterprises is known as private administration.

There are many views regarding the scope and range of activities to be included in public administration. Some thinkers take a broader view and include all governmental activities having for their purpose, the fulfilment of public policy, while others take a narrow view and consider only those activities concerned with the executive branch of the government as part of public administration.

The definitions given by important thinkers reveal the emphasis they lay on different aspects of public administration.

1. F.M. Marx (ed.), *Elements of Public Administration*, Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi, 1964, p. 4.
2. Pfiffner and Presthus, *Public Administration*, The Ronald Press Co., New York, 1960, p. 3.

There are some who equate the sphere of activity of public administration with the implementation of law and public policy. L.D. White observes:[3] "Public administration consists of all those operations having for their purpose the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy". Similarly, according to Woodrow Wilson, public administration is detailed and systematic application of law. In the words of Dimock, "Public Administration is the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy as declared by the competent authorities. . . . Public administration is law in action. It is the executive side of government".[4] There are writers like Simon who define the scope of public administration in such a way as to make it coincide with the activities of the executive or administrative branch only. Thinkers like Pfiffner lay more emphasis on the coordinating role of administration. In his opinion administration consists of "getting the work of government done by coordinating the efforts of the people so that they can work together to accomplish their set tasks".[5] F.A. Nigro's definition is a more comprehensive one, which also includes besides the above mentioned aspects, the relationship between public administration and the political and social systems as well. Nigro has defined public administration in the following words :[6]

Public administration

(a) is cooperative group effort in a public setting;

(b) covers all three branches—executive, legislative and judicial—and their interrelationships;

(c) has an important role in the formulation of public policy and is thus a part of the political process;

(d) is more important than, and also different in significant ways from private administration;

(e) as a field of study and practice has been much influenced in recent years by the human relations approach;

(f) is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals in providing services to the community.

Public administration is the non-political bureaucratic machinery of the government for implementing its laws and policies in action, e.g., the collection of revenues, maintenance of law and order, running the railways and postal services, maintaining an army, running schools and hospitals. These are all acts of

3. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, Macmillan Co., New York, 1955, p. 1.

4. Marshall, E. Dimock, "The Study of Administration", *American Political Science Review*, Feb. 1937, pp. 31-32.

5. J.M. Pfiffner, *Public Administration*, 1960, p. 6.

6. Felix A. Nigro, *Modern Public Administration*, Harper and Row, New York, 1965, p. 25.

public administration. Public administration operates within a political context. It is a means by which the policy decisions made by the political decision makers are carried out. "Public administration is decision-making, planning the work to be done. formulating objectives and goals, working with the legislative and citizen organizations to gain public support and funds for government programmes, establishing and revising organizations, directing and supervising employees, providing leadership, communicating and receiving communications, determining work methods and procedures, appraising performance, exercising controls, and other functions performed by government executives and supervisors. It is the action part of government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realised".[7]

To summarize, these definitions identify public administration with :

1. the formulation and implementation of public policies;
2. the executive branch of government;
3. organisational structures and machinery of administration;
4. administrative processes;
5. bureaucracy and its activities;
6. coordination of group activity or social relationship; and
7. interaction between organisations and their environment.

Evolution and Growth

Public administration as an activity is as old as civilization but public administration as an academic discipline is not even a hundred years old. This, however, does not mean by implication that thinkers in earlier ages had never said anything significant about public administration. Functioning of the governmental machinery has attracted the attention of scholars and administrators since the earliest periods of history. Kautilya's *Arthasastra*, the *Mahabharata*, the *Ramayana* and the maxims and teachings of Confucius in the realm of Oriental thought contain many profound observations about the organisation and working of government. In the history of western political thought, Aristotle's *Politics* and Machiavelli's *The Prince* are important contributions to administrative thought and practice.

However, scattered thoughts do not constitute a discipline and whatever administrative knowledge can be gleaned from recorded history reveals the fact that public administration was considered a part of political economy, military organization and religious practice.

7. John J. Corson and Joseph P. Harris, *Public Administration in Modern Society*, McGraw Hill, 1963, p. 12.

"Only when governments could be differentiated from other societal institutions and their activities developed to the point where professional administrators were indispensable for their effective performance, could modern public administration emerge. The term public administration began to creep into European languages during the seventeenth century to distinguish between the absolute monarch's administration of public affairs and his management of his private household. The contemporary discipline arose out of the bureaucratization of the nation-state when the church was separated from the state and government was superimposed on all other societal institutions within a definite territory".[8]

Modern public administration was first taught as a part of the training course of public officials-on-probation in Prussia. The subject was largely compiled and taught in a descriptive manner by professors of cameral sciences, which then included all knowledge considered necessary for the governance of an absolutist state. The cameralist approach continued to influence European studies in public administration well into the twentieth century, until it was replaced by the administrative law and legal studies approach. Ideologically cameralism gave way to liberalism and socialism, and authoritarianism gave way to bureaucracy. Civil service recruits had to study administrative law and gradually all over Europe public service training schools started offering courses on administrative law.

In English speaking countries with emphasis on generalist administrators circumstances were unfavourable for the emergence of a discipline of public administration. Special preparatory courses were not required for training the new recruits in a majority of services except the highly technical ones. The scope of government administration was traditionally lower than in Europe and administration was considered more of an experimental art rather than a subject to be taught theoretically.

With the expansion of governmental functions, the need for training practitioners in the art of public administration was felt. The study of public administration began in the United States, which led to its acceptance as a full-fledged discipline. Hence the evolution of the subject will be traced here largely in the context of the United States.

With expanding governmental functions public administration as an activity became highly diversified, complex and specialised. There was a growing need for better management of public affairs

8.   Herald E. Caiden, *The Dynamics of Public Administration : Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1911, p. 31.

through scientific investigations into governmental functioning and specialised training of public servants in the USA. An essay by Woodrow Wilson in 1887 symbolised the beginning of what was later to be an autonomous academic field of inquiry.

Many factors have contributed towards the growth of the study of public administration in the USA as a separate academic discipline in the present century.

Firstly, the development of modern sciences and technology made an impact on the life of the people and the functioning of the government. From the later half of the 19th century industrialization gave birth to large-scale organisations with complex problems of coordination and cooperation. Rapid technological developments created large scale social dislocations which made state intervention imperative and desirable. Hence scholars came to pay increasing time and attention to the problems of organization and management.

Secondly, the Scientific Management movement founded by F.W. Taylor which began in the USA towards the end of the 19th century, gave great impetus to the study of public administration. Taylor's ideas had a revolutionary impact not only in the US but throughout the world. His main thesis was that all work processes are separable into units; the efficacy of each unit can be tested and improved; the techniques can be extended upwards in every organization, making industries and governments, even societies, more efficient and rational.

A third factor which significantly helped in the growth of the subject of public administration was the gradual evolution of the concept of welfare state. The philosophy of state functions everywhere has now decisively shifted from the traditional notion of *laissez faire* to that of social welfare. The welfare movement has tremendously enlarged the scope of governmental functions, and administration, since public administration has become the chief instrument of social welfare.

Lastly, the movement for governmental reform gathered momentum in the USA from the early years of the present century when intellectual efforts were systematically made for the steady development and growth of an autonomous and specialised field of knowledge based on the structure and functioning of public administration. The quality of public services was poor and left much to be desired. The 'spoils system' of recruitment had led to considerable corruption and nepotism in appointments. Public finances were disorganized, and frequent scandals concerning public officials had caused great damage to their image. All this culminated in an insistent demand for administrative reform in the US. It was against this background of the reform movement that the emerging discipline of public administration in the USA took shape.

The evolution of public administration as an academic discipline falls into a number of critical stages. The first stage which begins with the publication of Woodrow Wilson's "The Study of Administration" in 1887 can be called the era of politics-administration dichotomy. Wilson is considered the founder of the academic discipline of public administration. Making a distinction between politics and administration, he argued that administration is concerned with implementation of political policy decisions. Another notable event of the period was the publication of Goodnow's *Politics and Administration* in 1900, which endorsed the Wilsonian theme further by conceptually distinguishing the two functions. According to him, "Politics has to do with policies or expressions of the state will", whereas "Administration has to do with the execution of these policies".[9] Apart from this, the institutional location of these two functions were differentiated. The location of politics was identified with the legislature and higher levels of the government where major policy decisions were taken. The location of administration was identified with the executive branch of the government and the bureaucracy.

In the early years of the present century, the impact of the reform movement in the US government permeated American universities, thus popularizing the study of public administration. As a result of the Taft Commission Report in the USA the Federal Budget and Accounting Act was passed in 1921, creating the Bureau of the Budget and institutionalising public administration in a big way. State governments in the US began to appoint commissions to study bureaucratic structure and organization, legislative-executive relationship, budgetary problems and proposals for better personnel administration.

The interaction between the government and the universities increased. In a report published in 1914, the American Political Science Association declared that one of the objectives of teaching political science was to prepare specialists for governmental positions. Thus the study of public administration gained increasing recognition in American universities. In 1926, Leonard D. White wrote *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* which was recognised as the first textbook on the subject. This book, while advocating a politics-administration dichotomy, stressed the human side of administration, dealing comprehensively with administration in government.

The second stage of evolution is marked by the tendency to reinforce the idea of politics-administration dichotomy and to evolve a value free 'science of management'. The central belief of this period was that there are certain 'principles' of administration

9. Frank J. Goodnow, *Politics and Administration*, New York, Macmillan, 1914, p. 22.

which was the task of scholars to discover and advocate. W.F. Willoughby's *Principles of Public Administration* (1927) first ushered in this new theme. Other important works of this period stressing this approach were *Principles of Organisation* by Mooney and Reiley, *Creative Experience* by Mary Parker Follett, Fayol's *Industrial and General Management* and *Papers on the Science of Public Administration* by Gulick and Urwick. The main reason for this upsurge of interest in administration, at least in the USA was that following the catastrophic years of the Great Depression in the thirties, the functions of the government had so rapidly multiplied that there were not enough skilled government personnel to fill in the welfare departments newly created under the New Deal. Therefore, schools of public administration were established to quickly train as many men and women as possible, in the techniques of administration.

The main difference between the protagonists of the politics-administration dichotomy of the first and second stages in the evolution of the discipline is that, while the early thinkers like Wilson and Charles Beard emphasized the legal and constitutional aspects, the new school of scientific management protagonists in the second period, emphasized a purely scientific approach to the study of public administration. So, while the earlier emphasis on the dichotomy of politics and administration was retained in the second stage of evolution, the techniques of study shifted from legal to scientific forms (e.g., work flow studies, time and motion studies, organizational charts etc.) Empirical studies were undertaken to find a scientifically accurate method of organizing human relationships in large scale organizations 'the one best way' to achieve a desirable level of organizational efficiency and economy. With the help of scientific management methods, the leaders of public administration tried to discover certain principles of public administration which could be of universal applicability.

Luther and Gulick coined the word POSDCORB[10] to promote some of these principles of administration. POSDCORB stands for Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting. These maxims of administration were said to be of universal applicability in all organizations.

The third stage began with a reaction against this mechanical approach. The so-called 'principles' of administration were challenged and dubbed as 'naturalistic fallacies' and 'proverbs'. Meanwhile scientific management in industry was also undergoing a broadening and humanizing process in response to insistent social needs and forces. The most notable contribution, in this connection, came from the famous Hawthorne experiments in the

10. Gulick and Urwick (eds), *Papers on the Science of Public Administration*, Institute of Public Administration, New York, 1937.

late 1920's carried out by a group of scholars at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company. The experiments which focused upon work groups, shook the foundations of scientific management school by clearly demonstrating the powerful influence of social and psychological factors on the worker's output. This approach to organisational analysis drew attention to the effect of informal organisation in the formal set-up, the phenomena of leadership and influence, and impact of conflict and cooperation among groups in the organisational environment. By pointing out the limitations of the 'machine' concept of organisational thought, it revealed the vital importance of human relations in organisations. Chester Barnard published the *Functions of the Executive* in 1953 and *Organisation and Management* a decade later, in which he stressed the psychological and behavioural factors in organisational analysis. In 1954, Peter Drucker wrote the *Practice of Management* in which he emphasized long range planning and human relations in industry and government.

The fourth stage was ushered in by two significant publications in the forties—Simon's *Administrative Behaviour* and Robert Dahl's essay entitled "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems". Simon's approach widened the scope of the subject by relating it to psychology, sociology, economics and political science. He rejected both the classical "principles" of administration and the 'politics-administration dichotomy' in administrative thought and practice. Simon's[11] was one of the first books in the behavioural field, wherein he argued that all of administration revolves around rationality and decision-making. In the development of the discipline, Simon identified two mutually supportive streams of thought. One was engaged in the development of a pure science of administration which required a solid base in social psychology. Another stream was concerned with the normative aspects of administration and prescription for public policy. The second approach would require a broad understanding of political science, economics and sociology as well. Simon favoured the co-existence of both the approaches, empirical and normative, for the growth and development of the discipline of public administration.

Dahl's[12] essay identified three important problems in the evolution of the science of public administration :

(i) The impossibility of excluding normative consideration from the problems of public administration. Values inevitably permeate administration while science is value-free.

11.   H.A. Simon, *Administrative Behaviour*, Growell, Collier and Macmillan, New York, 1947.

12.   R.A. Dahl, "The Science of Public Administration : Three Problems", *Public Administration Review* 7 (1947), pp. 1-11.

(ii) The second problem arises from the inescapable fact that the study of administration must include a study of human behaviour, which is open to all possible variables and uncertainties making it impossible to subject it to the rigours of scientific enquiry.

(iii) The tendency to enunciate universal principles based on a few examples drawn from limited national and historical settings.

The last point has been taken up as a challenge and considerable efforts have been made to study comparative public administration with special emphasis on the developing countries.

The fifth stage in the evolution of the discipline was marked by strenuous efforts to build a new and theoretically rigorous science of administration. Some of the other characteristics of this period are as follows.

Administration came to be viewed increasingly as a unit in the process of continuous interaction between the people inside and outside the organisation at any given period of time, e.g. some theorists developed the notion that the state of an organisation at a given moment is an equilibrium between, say, the demands of the clients for certain services, of the employees or officers for income, security, status and satisfaction in work, and of the leaders, controllers, or citizens, or shareholders, for the achievement of the goals nominally set down for the organisation, such as profits, tax revenue or land regulation. The significance of this view is that these last organisational goals are not, as in the traditional approach, regarded the ultimate justification for its operations, they are considered in combination with other equally legitimate aims of all the groups concerned, and even with another goal, the survival and expansion of the organisation itself.

Secondly, separate studies of public and private business administration tended to merge into a single science of organisation, whose theories and concepts were to be equally applicable to both private and public administration. Organization theory experienced a remarkable growth in the post-war era. Its findings concerning organizational dynamics, small-group behaviour, communications, leadership patterns, decision-making, open systems and human relations etc. are highly relevant to public administration. New insights in administration also came from management sciences and cybernetics theories.

Thirdly, the increasing use of the systems and behavioural approaches encouraged the comparative study of administrative systems, in diverse social settings and environments. New perspectives were badly needed and the impetus for study of comparative public administration and development administration, (a relatively unknown field before the Second World War) came from "great power competition, international humanitarianism, and appeals

for help from newly independent states." In the transference of western administrative knowhow to the developing countries, western administrative concepts were found to be inadequate and culture-bound. The result was a questioning of the traditional framework of public administration and its universal applicability. It was to fill in these gaps that F.W. Riggs[13] pioneered a new administrative vocabulary to describe different societal typologies, administrative cultures and systems.

Fourthly, with the ushering in of the computer age attempts were made to understand the decision making, and problem solving processes of the human mind with the help of computers and other mechanical aids. In his book, *The New Science of Management*, Simon tries to assess some of the effects of this new science. According to him, machines will be able to replace human labour in various spheres of work in the years to come though not in the most economical manner. With increasing scientific and technical knowledge at his disposal man will come to possess more political power of control over his fellow human beings.

The final stage of the evolution of public administration coincides with a general concern in the social sciences for public policy analysis. The emphasis can be generally noted as a post-World War II phenomenon, led by important scholars from public administration and political science. This approach was built upon two basic themes :

(a) the interpenetration of politics and administration at many levels ; and

(b) the programmatic character of all administration.

These themes directed attention in public administration towards political or policy making processes and specific public programmes. Like many other disciplines in social sciences—public administration was also shaken and influenced by the social turbulence and crisis-ridden period of the sixties. Since 1968, the evolving discipline of public administration has come to be enriched by the emergence of what has come to be known as the 'New Public Administration'. The major landmarks in the growth and emergence of New Public Administration are :

(i) The Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service, 1967, in U.S.A.

(ii) The Philadelphia Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 1967, in U.S.A.

(iii) The Minnowbrook Conference, 1968, in U.S.A.

---

13.   F.W. Riggs, *The Ecology of Public Administration*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.

(iv) Publication of *Toward a new Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, edited by Frank Marini, 1971 ;

(v) Publication of *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* edited by Dwight Waldo, 1971.

Some of the features of the new public administration may briefly be discussed as follows :[14]

(a) It is anti-positivist in more than one sense. It rejects a definition of public administration as 'value-free'.

(b) It rejects a rationalist and determinative view of mankind.

(c) It also rejects a politics administration dichotomy.

(d) It is anti-bureaucratic and anti-hierarchical.

(e) It is anti-mechanistic in its approach to organizational problems, rejecting the over-emphasis on the 'machine' and the 'system'.

New public administration therefore is marked by the above anti-goals. It displays an intense concern for relevant societal problems. It stresses ethics and values, innovation and social equality. It lays great emphasis on human relations, a creative approach to administration and social change. The study of formal organisation, its structure and processes is of secondary importance to the new theorists. The most important need of the times is to be alive to the contemporary social and political issues and problems with a view to finding ways and means for their solution. And to have organisational changes to suit the changing times. Therefore, to achieve its objectives, the new public administration should have the following characteristics :

(i) Increasing orientation towards changing reality.

(ii) Influence policies which can improve the quality of working life, as well as have competence to implement such policies.

(iii) More oriented towards measuring the impact of laws on citizens rather than resting content with their mechanical application.

(iv) More normative and less neutral.

The foregoing discussion amply proves that public administration has come a long way since 1887. It has established its credentials as an autonomous field of enquiry, with an ever expanding literature and concerns which have greatly influenced its evolution as an academic discipline. Scholars of public administration have sought to borrow a lot from other disciplines, making

14. Robert T. Gobmbiewski, *Public Administration As a Developing Discipline*, Marcel, Dekker. Inc., New York, 1947, pp. 8-24.

it truly inter-disciplinary in nature. Organizational dynamics also draws heavily on the management sciences. Public administration has faced both empirical and normative thrusts from time to time. It has also incorporated much new developments from the field of policy sciences.

Though public administration is not even a hundred years old, it has been marked by a growing output of literature mostly originating in the USA where the federal systems of government, a relatively open social system, and rapid technical change provide fertile spawning beds for reform movements and experimentation.

However, it must be pointed out that there is a close relationship between administrative theories and concepts on the one hand, and the cultural and technological changes of the society in which they develop, on the other. In the field of public administration, for example, the early period of politics and administration dichotomy was a logical reaction to the nepotism and corruption in the then prevailing administrative culture of the US which led to much deterioration in the standard and efficacy of public services. Later emphasis on human relations coincided with the rise of trade unions and the manpower shortages of the 40's. With the advent of the scientific and technological revolution in the West, the social and technological changes in the atomic and computer ages, reflected in the rigid efforts at mathematical exactness demands of later behaviouralism, and systems analysis in the contemporaneous literature of public administration. Recently the concern for social equity, comparative study of administrative systems and emphasis on the developmental goals of Third World administration coincides with a renewed acceptance of values and normative theory as basic features of the new public administration. In brief, the entire evolution and changing character of public administration has reflected in the changing character of technology and the social and economic problems associated therewith in the administration of different societies.

Approaches : Past and Present

Since 1887 there have been different approaches to the study of public administration when this subject as a separate academic dicipline was born. The traditional approaches concentrated on the formal legal and institutional aspects of organisations. The methods employed in the study were mainly historical and descriptive. The major concerns of the older literature on administration were the structure of personnel and financial administration, the administrative machinery, bureaucracy and functions of public administrators. The new approaches which mainly appeared after World War II came as a reaction to the older approaches.

Historical Approach : The historical approach is essentially based

on the belief that knowledge of history is absolutely essential for an indepth study of any subject. For a proper understanding of the subject the study of public administration of the past in particular periods is necessary to link up with the present administrative systems. For example, for a proper understanding of the background and growth of administration in India, a historical perspective is essential. To understand the evolution of the administrative system in India, the characteristics of British Indian Administration and also the pre-British period have to be studied. White's two volumes, *The Federalists* (1948) and *The Jeffersonians* (1951), are important studies of the federal administration of the USA during the early years of the Republic. Biographical and autobiographical studies are also closely related to the historical approach. In Europe and America reminiscences of ex-administrators reveal many important facets of administrative processes. Several volumes in the *Rulers of India* series and specialized studies dealing with tenures of particular Governor Generals during the British era, are important to the study of Indian administration of these periods.

Legal Approach : Exponents of this approach would like to study public administration as part of law and concentrate on the formal legal structure and organization of public bodies. Its chief concern has been with power—its structure and functions. It stresses the formal organisation of offices, official duties, limitations of power and discretionary authority of administrators. Its main sources are constitutions, codes of law, office manuals of rules and regulations and judicial decisions. Many countries of Europe like Germany, Belgium and France have particularly applied the legal approach to the study of public administration. In these countries there are two principal divisions of law—constitutional and administrative. Whereas constitutional law deals with the three main organisations of the government, their interrelations and the distribution of power among them, administrative law is mainly concerned with the structure and functions of public bodies, departments and authorities. The legal approach is valuable for the understanding of the legal framework within which the administrative system has to operate, but by neglecting the informal forces operating in the organization (the sociological and psychological variables), it remains to a great extent an incomplete approach to the study of public administration.

Institutional Approach : This approach tried to establish linkages between the study of public administration and the institutions of government. It approached the study of administration through the study of the structure and functioning of separate institutions and organisations of the state—such as the executive, the legislature, the departments, government corporations, boards and commissions. Scholars of this school defined the task of administration as non-political or technical which lay merely in the field of policy implementation. They were mainly advocates of the politics-

administration dichotomy and their efforts were channelized towards discovering 'principles' of public administration. However, the majority of scholars of this approach like L. D. White and Luther Gulick were content merely with description of institutional structures without any attempt at theory building. This is essentially descriptive though attempts have been made by some thinkers to combine normative elements with the descriptive. Some of these have not only described the institutions but also suggested ideas for reform, where necessary.

Among the older approaches the scientific management approach, the classical approach and the human relations approach may also be included. These three approaches have been discussed in the next chapter. Among the current new approaches we shall include the behavioural, systems, structural-functional and the ecological approaches to the study of public administration.

Behavioural Approach : Modern behaviouralism which developed in the late 30's and 40's of this century is mainly concerned with the scientific study of human behaviour in diverse social environments. It started as a protest against traditional, historical, normative and largely descriptive approaches, in the social sciences. In public administration behaviouralism as a distinct line of study started in the 1930's with the Human Relations Movement and was later developed by Chester Barnard,[15] Herbert Simon,[16] and others. Simon observed that "administrative behaviour" is a part of the behavioural sciences and the study of public administration should involve the study of individual and collective human behaviour in administrative situations. It brings to bear upon administrative problems an interdisciplinary approach which includes sociology, social psychology and cultural anthropology. The behavioural approach in administrative studies has the following salient features :

1. Its literature is descriptive, rather than prescriptive, with the studies on motivation being an exception.

2. Increased attention is paid to the individual based on more realistic research concerning motivation, decision-making processes and the nature of authority.

3. Stress is laid on informal relationships and communication patterns among members of an organization.

4. It emphasizes operational definitions of terms and empirical study based on rigorous methods such as field study, laboratory experiments or use of other statistical methods.

15. Chester Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, May 1938.

16. Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behaviour*, Macmillan, New York, 1987.

5. It is chiefly though not exclusively concerned with quantification, and formal theory construction.

6. It is interdisciplinary in character, and makes considerable use of propositions drawn from other social sciences.

In short, the behaviouralists sought to adopt an integrated and interdisciplinary approach, for, according to them all human actions are motivated by social, economic, political, or psychological environment from which they come. This approach aims at substituting empirical and realistic judgments for the purely value-oriented. It also emphasizes a scientific approach to the study of administrative problems and their solution.

The behavioural approach in public administration has given an additional impetus to scientific research and systematic theory construction. The scholars in the field of public administration have made "cross structural, cross-national and cross-cultural" studies of administrative behaviour. This has helped in the development of knowledge of public administration in the comparative context. In the field of comparative public administration Robert Presthus and Michael Crozier[17] have conducted empirical studies of bureaucratic behaviour in different social and cultural perspectives. In India also a number of scholars have used behavioural techniques in research like Pai Panandikar, Kuldeep Mathur, Ramashray Roy. Shanti Kothari, C.P. Bhambhri[18]. Contemporary research in administrative behaviour has been classified by Herbert Simon as follows :

(i) The study of bureaucracy ; (Robert Merton, Peter Blau and others using and extending upon the Weberian Model);

(ii) Human relations pertaining to motivation and increasing job satisfaction (Chris Argyris, Warren Bennis and others);

(iii) Motivation studies using the Barnard Simon Equilibrium Model; and

(iv) Decision making studies emphasizing primarily cognitive processes and the rational components of administrative behaviour.[19]

17. Robert Presthus, "Behaviour and Bureaucracy in Many Cultures", *Public Administration Review*, XIX (1959) pp. 25-35; Michael Crozier, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.

18. Pai Panandikar has made an empirical analysis of values and behaviours of India's developmental administrators; Roy and Kothari have made an empirical study of the relationship between politicians and administrators of a UP district, Kuldeep Mathur has studied the background, approaches and values of Sub-divisional Development Officers of UP and Rajasthan, and C.P. Bhambhri has studied the behavioural patterns of IAS officers.

19. Ramesh K. Arora, *Comparative Public Administration : An Ecological Perspective*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1979, p. 16.

The behavioural approach has been criticised for being of limited utility in the analysis of all types of administrative phenomena. It is contended that the study of man as a social animal, though in itself praiseworthy, cannot be considered a part of the administrative sciences unless the resulting knowledge is particularly applicable to the 'administrative man'. Moreover, the behavioural sciences, it is maintained, appear to be largely valid and applicable to small social groups, whereas the study of public administration deals with larger communities. Secondly, the total exclusion of values from a study of administrative problems and phenomena will make the study of public administration rather sterile and irrelevant to the vital issues of the modern age. Human values, needless to say, are not directly quantifiable or observable to the degree that physical phenomena are, or can be.

The behavioural approach, therefore, appears to be of limited relevance in dealing with all types of administrative problems and their solution, since the complexity and variability of human nature, motivations and behaviour preclude the attainment of precision that is so characteristic of the physical sciences. Value-oriented or normative problems and issues of organisation cannot really be explained or interpreted in terms of the behavioural approach.

Systems Approach : One of the most significant landmarks in the evolution of organization theory is the development of general systems concept for organizational analysis. The origin of general systems is traced to the thinking of the biologist Von Bertalanffy, in the twenties. But it was only due to the quest of a number of post-World War II scholars for a body of concepts lending unity to studies, undertaken in various disciplines, that the concept of 'system' was developed. In short, general systems theory originated in a movement aimed at the unification of science and scientific analysis. The term 'system' has been defined as a complex whole, a set of connected things or parts. According to this approach in organizational analysis, an organization can be considered a social system to be studied in its totality. In other words, a system is a collection of interrelated parts which receives inputs, acts upon them in an organized or planned manner and thereby produces certain outputs.

There is a growing trend to place all types of organisations within the broad framework of general systems theory. A system is seen as an assembly of interdependent parts (sub-systems) who interact among themselves. Interdependence implies that a change in one part influences other parts, ultimately affecting the entire system. Individuals are viewed as the basic unit of organisational systems.

All human organisations are open sub-systems engaged in transactions within the larger social system, that is, society. All

sub-systems receive inputs in the form of human and material resources from the larger system, while giving out outputs in the form of products, services or rewards to its members as well as to the larger system.

Other features of organisational sub-systems are—they are adaptive; they affect the larger system as well as are affected by it; they are dynamic in the sense that they undergo continuous change as a result of interaction with other sub-systems within the larger social system.

The chief contributor to systems analysis in organizational theory is Herbert Simon. Simon views the organization as a total system, a composite of all the sub-systems which serve to produce the desired output. His basic assumption is that the elements of organizational structure and function emanate from the characteristics of human problem-solving processes and rational choice.[20] Therefore, the organization is viewed as a system comprising individuals making choices and behaving on the basis of their reactions to their needs and environment.

The chief value of the systems approach lies in the systematic search for significant interactions while evaluating policies or actions of any organization. What systems analysts are set to achieve is to predict the system's movements by interpreting the relationships between its parts.

The systems approach is particularly relevant to the study of large public organisations operating in larger social, political and economic environments.

C. West Churchman[21] draws attention to five basic considerations in relation to the systems approach to management :

1. The total objectives of the system and the measures of system's performance.

2. The system's environment acting as a constraint.

3. The system's resources that are put to use in performance.

4. The system's components and its goals and activities.

5. The management of the system (the regulating and decision making aspect).

The organisation has been conceived by many administrative thinkers as a socio-technical system comprising both the social and technical variables. It is not merely an assembly of buildings, money, machines and processes. The system consists in the organisation of people around various technologies, whose

---

20. Herbert Simon and James March, *Organizations*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1959, p. 169.
21. C. West Churchman, *The Systems Approach*, Dell, New York, 1968,

motivation, behaviour and relationships determine both the quality and quantity of its inputs and outputs.

As Miller and Rice put it : "Any enterprise may be seen as an open system which has characteristics in common with a biological organism. An open system exists, and can exist, only by exchanging materials with its environment. It imports materials, transforms them by means of conversion processes, consumes the products of conversion for internal maintenance, and exports the rest. Directly or indirectly, it exchanges its outputs for further intake, including more resources to maintain itself. These import-conversion-export processes are the work the enterprise has to do if it is to live."[22]

The systems approach to organisational analysis is now widely used. This approach can take into account more variables and interrelationships while looking at an organisational problem in the framework of a larger system. Another important dimension is the interaction between a system and its environment. The underlying assumption of the systems approach is that there is a continuous mutual interaction between the system and its environment. This conceptualisation was to eventually become the precursor of the 'ecological' approach to organisational study.

Structural Functional Approach : The structural functional approach as an analytical tool in the social sciences developed from the work of the anthropologist Malinowski and Radcliffe Brown in the early years of the present century. The important followers of this approach are Gabriel Almond, David Apter, Talcott Parsons, Rebert Merton and Fred Riggs. The two concepts basic to the approach are structure and function. All social structures exist to perform certain functions. While functions concern the consequences of patterns of action, structures refer to the patterns of actions and the resultant institutions of the systems themselves.

The structural functional framework provides an important mechanism for the analysis of different social processes. In structural functionalism social structure is viewed as 'any pattern of behaviour which has become a standard feature of a social system.' There may be 'concrete' structures (e.g. government departments and bureaux) or 'analytic' (e.g. structure of authority or power). All social structures perform some 'functions'. In structural functional terms, a 'function' involves 'a pattern of interdependence between two or more structures, a relationship between variables. It refers to "any consequences of a structure in so far as they affect other structures or the total system of which

22. E.J. Miller and A.K. Rice, *Systems of Organisation*, Tavistock Publications, London, 1976, p. 3.

they are a part."[23]

The structural functional categories presuppose a systems framework. The experts can locate the structures they want to analyse and their functions, e.g. to analyse the working of bureaucracy in any society it is first defined and identified in structural functional terms. Structurally bureaucracy is viewed as an administrative system possessing features such as hierarchy, specialization, system of rules, and role specificity. The set of behavioural characteristics identified with bureaucracy are rationality, impersonality, rule orientation and neutrality. However, it may be clarified at the outset that there is no clear and direct relationship between structures and functions. All similar structures do not necessarily perform similar functions. A social structure may perform multiple functions and similarly one function may be performed by more than one structure. Structural-functionalists have helped to clarify the general misconception that similar structures in diverse environments perform similar functions or that absence of certain structures implies that particular functions are not being performed in particular social systems.

Notwithstanding the fact that structures and functions are not uniform in all societies various scholars of this approach have laid down what they consider certain necessary structural and functional prerequisites for the emergence of a society. Though various scholars have laid down different "prerequisites," these requisite functions have been greatly helpful in the comparative analysis of different social systems.

According to Riggs, there are five functional requisites of any society. These are economic, social, communicational, symbolic and political.[24] He has applied these functional requisites to the study of the administrative sub-system. Later he developed his Agraria-Transitia-Industria Model for the comparative study of administrative systems as a part of the wider social system.

Since then various other thinkers have adopted this approach in comparative public administration. This approach has helped to prove the vital points of difference between the administrative culture and processes of the developing and developed societies.

Certain structures of developing societies, which though apparently dysfunctional from the western point of view, may prove to be functional in their own social or political milieu. In developed societies, structures and functions may be relatively differentiated and autonomous in operation, unlike developing ones where functions may be differentiated, but the structures which perform these functions are rarely separate or distinct.

23. Ramesh K. Arora, *Comparative Public Administration*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1979, p. 106.
24. F.W., Riggs, "Trends in the Comparative Study of Administration", *IRAS* 28 (1962).

Ecological Approach :   Various scholars and administrators have often referred to the need to relate public administration to the environment in which it functions. 'Ecology' refers to "the mutual relations, collectively, between organism and their environment".   The ecological perspective in the study of public administration was introduced primarily through the writings of John Gaus, who first elaborated this approach in his *Reflections of Public Administration* in 1945. Gaus advocated the concept of relating government functions to the environment which included such factors as people, situation, scientific technology, social technology, wishes and ideas, catastrophe and personality.   These factors, he concluded, must be included in the 'ecological' study of public administration.[25]

The ecological approach assumes that administrative behaviour is peculiarly moulded by the values of the administrative culture in which it functions, the administrative culture in turn being an outgrowth of the interaction of values and traits of the administrative system with the social system as a whole.

The ecological approach is further based on the idea that an administrative system may not act as an independent variable in all circumstances.   It acts and reacts under the influence of various sub-systems surrounding it.   There is a great degree of interdependence between all social organisations and their ecological settings—which include among others topography, population, level of physical and social technology and the inter-relationships and interactions between people and organisations. Organisations, structures, procedures and goals are largely created and changed as a result of the interaction between an organization and its environment.   Thus, if an organization is to survive it must adapt itself to the changing needs and conditions of its external environment which is continuously changing. In a highly industrialised and developed society like the USA the system of government and administration must not only cater to public needs and demands, but also to the compulsions of the American economy. The level of production and consumption of material goods is the highest in the USA compared to any other country in the world. Therefore, the administrative framework most favoured in that country is a free market system through which Americans are able to make free choices in production and consumption.   A capitalistic economy with a democratic system of minimum state intervention and controls is what the Americans have found suitable and that has existed in the country with only minor variations from time to time.

In developing countries the two main goals of administration

---

25.   J.M. Gaus, *Reflections of Public Administration*, University of Alabama Press, 1947.

are nation-building and socio-economic progress. Administration in these countries functions in an environment of scarcity and multiple pressures and controls.

Most of these ex-colonial developing countries inherited an authoritarian and unresponsive administrative culture, from their colonial days, which they carried into their systems even after the post-independence adoption of rationalist western models of administration. It has often been found that mere imposition of western administrative systems on the developing societies did not lead to their functioning in the same manner as they did in the West. The Weberian model of bureaucracy, for example, has been found to be dysfunctional for development in the Third World societies.

Fred W. Riggs is one of the foremost exponents of the ecological approach in public administration. On the basis of certain functional prerequisites of a social system, Riggs attempted a veriety of models and typologies such as the "agraria-transitia-industria" and fused-prismatic-diffracted societies.[26] His quest for an ecological perspective in cross-cultural studies led him mainly to the field of development administration. His ecological models emphasize an open system perspective that attempts to describe and analyse the interaction between the administrative sub-system and the wider social system.

Robert Dahl's advocacy of an ecological approach was based on what he stated were three problematic issues :

(i) Administrative generalizations based on the experience of one nation-state cannot be universally applied to administrative systems in all kinds of diverse environmental settings.

(ii) Before formulating theories and concepts of administration, it is necessary to empirically test their validity in all types of social settings to see what is universal.

(iii) This implies that public administration must be truly interdisciplinary and ecological in character, not only to widen its horizon but to make its study more scientific and relevant to all types of societies.

The great merit of this approach lies in the value and relevance of studying people in relation to their environment, taking into consideration their peculiar characteristics and problems. Public cooperation is a vital input for the successful operation of any administrative system. Unless the administration caters to particular public needs, wishes, activities and problems

26. Fred W. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1964.

they cannot solicit public cooperation to the extent desired. In the Third World countries, public administration is ridden with corruption, inertia and inefficiency. To improve their functioning one has to suggest solutions and reforms keeping in mind the peculiar history, customs, traditions and culture of the people, coupled with their present needs and aspirations. Every popular, efficient and democratic administration, must be ecological in character and approach.

Challenges in Colonial Societies

Colonialism is the establishment and maintenance of rule, for an extended time, over an alien people which are different from, and subordinate to the ruling power. Colonialism has now come to be identified with rule over people of different races inhabiting lands separated by land and water from the imperial centre. More particularly, it signifies direct political control by European states or states where Europeans have settled, over peoples of other races, notably over Asians and Africans. Some more features of colonialism are: "domination of an alien minority, asserting racial and cultural superiority, over a materially inferior native majority, contact between a machine oriented 'modern' civilization, a powerful economy, and a rapid rhythm of life and a 'backward' civilization that lacks machines and is marked by a stagnant economy and a slow rhythm of life, and the imposition of the first civilization upon the second."[27]

Though the history of colonization can be traced to the ancient colonial empires of Egypt, Rome and Greece, to 300 B.C., the history of modern colonialism begins roughly from the fifteenth century when the Europeans discovered the route to the East and America. America was subsequently colonised by Britain which later spread its empire to Canada, Australia, and various parts of Asia and Africa. France, Spain, Holland and Portugal followed suit to colonise various parts of the world, mainly Asia and Africa. The main characteristics of colonial rule have been economic exploitation of the colonies, undemocratic and irresponsible systems of government, where frequently the ruling country resorted to devious methods, including use of force to maintain law and order. The colonial version of British, French or any other systems of administration was suited to the requirements of the ruling countries rather than to the colonies. They were elitist, aloof, authoritarian and paternalistic. Colonialism was essentially rule by bureaucracy over the natives with policy guidance from the mother country.

The imperial powers, of necessity, established bureaucratic

27. *International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, Macmillan, 1968, pp. 1-5.

system of administration in their colonies for safeguarding and protecting their vital interests. Lucian Pye observes[28] :

> It is of profound significance that the overriding stress in all western efforts to make traditional societies into nations has been in the sphere of developing administrative capabilities. During the era of colonialism it was universally assumed that the process of political development involved primarily the creation and the effective operation of the authoritative instruments of the modern state. Whatever other motives were present, it was always believed that the highest expression of enlightenment was to be found in efforts to provide a society with efficient, competent and rational administration. Political development meant the suppression of all irrationalities, emotionalisms and wildly contending forces, in favour of coldly efficient, intelligent and far-sighted management of public affairs.

The era of colonialism is far too close to us for any definitive and objective assessment of it to be possible. A few salient features of colonial administration may be discussed here.

1. Colonialism imposed alien and authoritarian regimes on subordinate societies. These regimes tended to train a few of their subjects in bureaucratic management and required passive acquiescence from the remainder. Colonial administration is in essence undemocratic, authoritarian, elitist, and unresponsive to public needs and aspirations.

2. The main role of colonial administration is to maintain remote bureaucratic control over the colonies with minimum investment over them in terms of welfare services or other benefits while expecting maximum return in tangible (wealth) and intangible (prestige, status, power) resources from the colonies. The essential base of colonial administration lies in economic exploitation of the colonies by the imperial power.

3. The bureaucracies are generally manned by citizens of the imperial powers in the early stages to be gradually supplemented by an elite group of natives, who by their privileged position in colonial society are generally the most stable supporters of the colonial regime.

4. The administrative functions are mainly confined to looking after the interests of a few and are regulatory in nature, with due emphasis on law and order and revenue collection. However, with the gradual consolidation of colonial power, all imperial

---

28. Lucian Pye, "The Political Context of National Development", in Irving Swerdlon (ed), *Development Administration, Concepts and Problems*, Syracuse University Press, 1963, p. 28.

administrators attempt to introduce some measure of welfare administration in the colonies, either as a conciliatory gesture towards rebellious natives or as a precautionary measure against incipient rebellion in the colonies.

5. Welfare services provided to the subject peoples may take the form of establishing educational and medical institutions, developing communication facilities like railways, post and telegraph or opening new avenues of employment for the subjects by creating an infrastructure for industrial development.

With the dissolution of most of the colonial empires in the early second half of the twentieth century (except the Portuguese who delayed the process of decolonization till the eighties) the study of colonial administration has lost much immediate urgency and is studied now mainly for historical value and academic interest as one type in the evolution of various administrative processes.

Colonial Administration: The Indian Example

The history of British imperialism in India covers a long period of about two hundred years beginning from the last days of the decadent Moghul empire in the eighteenth century till the advent of independence in 1947. The first phase beginning from the last days of the Moghul rule and lasting till about the first decade of the nineteenth century may be described as an era in which the East India Company adhered to the policy of economic plunder and territorial annexation for the sake of monopoly trade. The second phase beginning from about 1813 and lasting till about 1857 may be regarded as a period in which some reasonable reforms took place for bringing about a reconciliation between the divergent interests of the Company officials and the controllers of British government. The final phase beginning from 1858 and lasting till 1947 which witnessed the incipient India's freedom movement gather momentum may be described as the most fertile period of contemporary Indian history in which India moved from a colony to an independent country.

The British administration in India had three features:[29]

1. Supervision of overseas affairs through a central office in the British capital.

2. Assignment of specific authority to a representative of the

29. For details on the pre-independence British Indian administration see, B.B. Misra, *The Administrative History of India*, Oxford Press, London, 1970; Shriram Maheshwari, *Evolution of Indian Administration*, Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 1970; Robert I. Crane and N. Gerald Barrier, *British Imperial Policy in India and Sri Lanka*, Heritage, New Delhi, 1981.

Crown on the spot and to provide him with adequate administrative assistance.

3. To encourage the participation of the colonial inhabitants to the greatest extent practicable.

The British colonial office depended too much on the Viceroy who had a small coterie of administrators on whom he depended. The administration was influenced by generalist administrators who specialised in law and order functions. Their attitude towards the natives could best be termed as patriarchal. They kept a safe distance and aloofness from the ordinary people, considering themselves the best judges and custodians of public interest. Economic welfare was not one of their priorities.

The colonial service comprised an elite group and most of the middle grade and subordinate duties were carried out by local institutions or locally recruited staff. In developing the new colonial administration the British adopted members of the Indian Civil Service (ICS) as the key officials in whose hands were concentrated both executive and judicial authority. An entirely new network had to be evolved to bring to the people services they had not hitherto enjoyed and which they often had to be persuaded to make use of. Some of these ICS officials worked at headquarters offices where matters of protocol were more important, but many took charge of posts in out-of-the-way places where they depended a good deal on their own ingenuity and resources, performing clerical as well as magisterial work at their own mini-headquarters, or undertaking tours in the field.

Among the institutions which India inherited from Britain, the best is the civil service. The pre-independence ICS was meant to strengthen the colonial structure and expand British dominance in India. The main task of the bureaucracy was the maintenance of law and order, and welfare administration was never its goal. The British governors acted on policy guidelines from home.

The Indians looked upon the ICS as the greatest instrument of colonial exploitation. The members of the ICS came from the elite in India and Britain which coloured their attitude towards ordinary people. The majority of top administrators who were the privileged classes under colonial administration wanted to strengthen the foundation of British empire. They felt social welfare services may lead in the long run to sowing the seeds of discontent. However, it is to be admitted that the British administration in India though performing only regulatory functions at first, started delivering welfare services to the people from the late nineteenth century onwards. With the introduction of western education, railways, post and telegraph, hospitals and avenues of employment a network of social services came to be provided to the Indian people by the British administrators.

Challenges in Industrial Societies

The term 'industrial' societies here will be used to mean all those developed countries of Western Europe and the USA where industrialization has produced an identifiable change in economic structure and growth followed later by political and administrative modernization. 'Development' and 'modernization' both imply in a broad sense societal transformations involving a complex of economic, social and political changes. "An individual country may simultaneously exhibit some traits that appear to be developed and others that appear to be less developed. Some features of public administration may likewise appear developed, while others in the same country—indeed in the same capital city—may resemble the administrative features of a less developed country. There are differences in public administration at each pole of the development continuum that do not reflect the stage of development as much as they reflect peculiar historical experiences or cultural traits.[30] Riggs has defined development as 'a process of increasing autonomy (discretion) of social systems, and made possible, by rising level of 'diffraction'. While discretion is the ability to choose among alternatives, 'diffraction' refers to the degree of differentiation and integration in a social system."[31]

Social scientists tend to disagree among themselves about the characteristics of development. Economists equate it with the capacity to produce a high level of material output or resources in relation to size of population—translated in concrete terms such as industrial and agricultural produce, raw material, national and per capita income. Others focus on the forms of social and economic organization of developed countries like a relative measure of :

1. Justice and equality;

2. Utilization of modern technology;

3. Criteria of rewards based on achievement rather than ascription; and

4. Political and administrative modernization.

However, the concept of political modernization is itself tricky, subject as it is to multiple connotations. Eisenstadt and Diamant equate political development with the ability of a political system to grow or adjust to new demands upon it. Gabriel Almond, using "change" as a synonym for "development" defines political change as the "acquisition of a new capability, in the sense of a specialized role, structure and differentiated orientation which together give the political system the possibility of responding efficiently, and more

30.   Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration*, Rand McNally College Publishing Company, Chicago, 1970, p. 29.

31.   Ramesh K. Arora, *Comparative Public Administration*, p. 143.

or less autonomously, to a new range of problems."[32] However, La Palombara has objected to the use of the concept for three reasons. Firstly, he says it leads to the erroneous implication that a "modern" political system is one that exists in industrial societies with high level of material development. Secondly, the concept is value-laden, using western standards of modernity. Thirdly, he thinks that such a term suggests "a deterministic uni-linear theory of political evolution" which is not what it should be.[33]

Some of the important features of the administrative systems of the industrial societies, which despite individual differences, can be distinguished as a group from other developing countries, are as follows :

1. Governmental organization is highly differentiated and functionally specific and the allocation of roles are based more on achievement criteria than on ascriptive ones. The bureaucracy is marked by a high degree of internal specialization. Recruitment of personnel is generally based on merit.

2. Laws and political decisions are largely rational. Traditional elites have lost real power, if any, to affect public policy making.

3. Government and administration have become all pervasive, affecting all major spheres of the life of citizens.

4. There is a high correlation between political power and legitimacy since popular interest and involvement in public affairs is widespread.

Incumbents of political or governmental office are widely viewed as legitimate holders of those positions and transfer of power and positions tend to occur in accordance with prescribed rules and procedures.

Some of the characteristics have been reflected in the nature of the public administration of these industrial societies.[34]

1. Public bureaucracies are large, and organizationally complex with diverse functions, divided as they are in numerous units and sub-units. These units require personnel both of a generalist and technical character, and together they represent the full range of occupational specializations that are found in those societies. Structurally and functionally the bureaucracies tend to resemble the Weberian type.

32. Gabriel Almond, "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems", *World Politics*, XVII, No. 2, Jan. 1965, pp. 183-214.
33. La Palombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963, pp. 35-39.
34. Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration : A Comparative Perspetive*, Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966, pp. 38-39.

2.   The bureaucracy exhibits to a marked degree professionalism both in the sense of identification with the public service as a profession and in the sense of belonging to a narrower field of professional or technical specialization within the service, such as law, engineering or social work. This professional outlook is the result of various factors, such as educational background, career orientation and standards of competence applied in recruitment to the public service as against private sector.

3.   Due to the relative stability of political systems, in these societies, the bureaucracy is more fully developed, its role in the political process is fairly clear and it is generally accepted in practice as an autonomous institution. In functional terms, the bureaucracy is primarily involved in rule application, performing secondary functions of rule-making and interest aggregation to a limited extent.

4.   The bureaucracy in a modernized polity will be subject to effective policy control by other functionally specific political institutions.

The tasks of public administration in industrial societies do not differ in theory from other societies where the primary task of public administration is to implement public laws and policies. However, as empirical studies have proved that numerous linkages exist between the features of an administrative system and their environment, the role and challenges of public administration in industrial societies have to be viewed in their particular socio-economic and cultural context. The history of public administration as an activity and as a discipline is inextricably linked with the administrative evolution of industrial societies. The development of modern sciences and technology in industrial societies has led to a tremendous impact on the life of the people and the activities of the government. Industrialization has created huge organizations. These in turn, have created complex problems of social co-operation and administrative co-ordination, which if not met in time, may cause the ruin of society. Unless the structure and functions of social organizations and management practices keep pace with the increased powers science and technology have placed into the hands of man, these inventions may bring the doom of man.

The great extension of the basic communication network in these societies has greatly widened the effective scope of administrative activity, while simultaneously increasing the responsibilities of public administration and causing it to reach out for new means of fulfilling its new duties and growing role. The public services in industrial societies do not differ in theory, organization or technique from the administration in developing societies but in practice differences inevitably crop up due to the difference in

environment. Most of the industrial societies are democratic welfare states, where the public administration has a challenging role to play in order to fulfil its democratic and welfare tasks. It has to be both responsive and responsible to the public. The citizens of advanced industrial societies are used to effective and efficient public services. Bureaucracies have to perform both routine and welfare tasks as efficiently and economically as possible, within a specific time framework.

The citizens of these societies have increasingly come to view public administrators as an impartial, and expert body of professionals intellectually equipped to cope with their administrative needs. In fact the entire discipline of public administration has evolved and grown with the changing public administrative culture of the industrial societies. As stated earlier, there was and still is a close relationship between the various theoretical concepts and approaches of public administration as a subject and the actual social and technical problems of industrial societies.

Commenting on the special administrative problems of industrial societies Ira Sharkansky writes:

> A problem that appears widely in more developed countries is a lack of coherence in relations between numerous service and regulatory agencies. The problem is often pronounced at local levels, where authorities design and implement their own programs, as well as implement programs designed and funded in part by national authorities. 'Who controls what ?' is a topic of some concern when many units share policy design, funding and implementation. A typical result is control by bureaucratic elites who operate within their specialized domains. There is occasional dominance by politicians who take an interest in a particular matter, but there is also a lack of general integration of programs by elected officials.[35]

Most of the industrial societies especially in Europe are typical examples of the 'Administrative State'. The bureaucracy in these states mainly performs three types of functions:

1. Regulatory and preventive functions, enforcing laws, collecting revenue, and protecting the state against external aggression.

2. Service functions—making provisions for education, health, culture and recreation, social insurance, unemployment relief, housing, transportation, and communication.

3. Entrepreneurial functions—operating industrial enterprises, loaning funds etc. In industrial countries with planned economies, the public administration acts as the chief agent of planned economic development and social change. To maintain the existing

---

35. Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration*, p. 33.

level or even to increase the economic growth and development of their societies the public bureaucracies are being continuously asked to live up to the role and meet the challenges posed before them.

Socio-economic Challenges in the Third World

One of the most significant and far-reaching political realities of the post-World War II era has been the gradual ebbing out of the era of colonialism and the emergence on the world scene of the newly independent states of the Third World nations of Asia, Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. There is a wide range of differences in the location, resources, history, culture, potitical systems and developmental patterns of these countries, yet they can all be termed "developing." Most of these new self-governing states are caught up in the process of transition, facing acute problems of social upheavals, economic depression and administrative chaos. In terms of societal models, they are moving from the traditional towards the modern type, from what Fred Riggs once called, "Agraria" towards "Industria".

Despite differences in the political and developmental patterns of these countries, there is a widely shared consensus among the majority of the people and their leaders regarding the goals of development towards which efforts should be directed. The majority of scholars on comparative administration agree that the two major elements of the developmental objectives are nation-building and socio-economic progress. Esman describes nation building as "the deliberate fashioning of an integrated political community within the fixed geographic boundaries in which the nation-state is the dominant political institution."[36]

In most of the developing states the geographical boundaries are arbitrarily carved by colonial rulers at the time of independence with scant regard for ethnic groupings, cultural ties or the feelings of minorities opposed to integration. This has resulted in periodic outbursts of communal frenzy, inter-group clashes, riots and secessionist tendencies in the majority of these states.

The related objective of social and economic progress has been defined by Esman as "the sustained and widely diffused improvement in material and social welfare."[37]

Though the goals of development are more or less similar, the patterns chosen by different countries to achieve them have been diverse and experimental in nature. However, there is a strong trend towards concentration of power in the hands of the executive at the centre based on the notion that such widespread goals

36. Milton J. Esman, "The Politics of Development Administration," in Montgomery and Siffin, *Approaches to Development Politics, Administration and Change*, McGraw Hill Company, New York, 1966, p. 59.
37. *ibid.*, p. 60.

make centralization inevitable. Some of the major features of the socio-political systems of these countries appear to be as follows :

1. A relatively widespread consensus on developmental goals. Some of the common goals are introducing changes in almost all the sectors of the economy including social overheads, infrastructural facilities, and productive enterprises like industry and agriculture; social services such as health, education and water supply; infrastructural like roads and communication facilities, electricity and market centres, and productive activities in industry and agriculture are sought to be developed within particular time spans;

2. A great degree of reliance on the state and bureaucracy for achieving developmental goals. Many developing countries have evolved structures that have a socialist orientation;

3. Social disorganization, economic backwardness and political instability; and

4. A wide gap between the modernizing and the traditional elites, who very often differ in social background, orientation towards change, and in their respective linkages to the mass of the population. The modernizing elites tend to be from the urban areas; they are well educated westernized young men and women committed to economic, social and political change and modernization. The traditional elites tend to be rural, oriented to local customs and to the native religion, and opposed to change as a threat to these values.

The following five points are indicative of general administrative patterns currently found in developing countries of the Third World.[38]

1. The basic pattern of public administration is imitative rather than indigenous. All countries, including those that are not ex-colonies have consciously tried to introduce some version of the bureaucratic model in administration. Usually, it is patterned after a particular national administrative model, perhaps with incidental features borrowed from some other system. Ex-colonies will almost certainly resemble the parent administratively.

2. The bureaucracies are deficient in the requisite skills necessary for developmental programmes. The problem is not a general shortage of employable manpower, actually the typical developing country is generally overpopulated with an abundance of labour in relation to other resources. The shortage is in trained administrators, with management capacity, developmental skills, and technical proficiency.

38. Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration : A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey, 1966, pp. 69-72.

3. Another tendency is for these bureaucracies to emphasize non-productive orientations. Much bureaucratic activity is channelled towards the realization of non-developmental goals. Riggs refers to this as a preference among bureaucrats for personal expediency as against principled public interests. The value attached to status based on ascription rather than achievement explains much of this behaviour. Non-merit considerations may greatly influence promotions, assignments, dismissals, and other personnel practices. Corruption is also widespread. Another problematic popular practice is that of using the public service as a substitute for a social security programme or to relieve the problem of unemployment. There is always a surplus of employees in the public services.

4. The widespread discrepancy between form and reality is another distinguishing characteristic. Riggs has called this "formalism." It reflects an urge to make things seem more as they presumably ought to be rather than what they really are. The gap between expectation and reality can be partially filled by enacting laws that cannot be enforced, adopting personnel regulations that are quietly bypassed, announcing a programme for delegation of administrative authority while keeping tight control over decision-making at the centre, or reporting as having met production targets, which in fact remain only partially fulfilled.

5. The bureaucracy in a developing country is apt to have a generous measure of operational autonomy, which can be accounted for by the coincidence of several operating forces in a newly independent nation. Colonialism was essentially rule by an unresponsive authoritarian bureaucracy. Groups capable of competing for political influence or of imposing close controls over the bureaucracy are few, so that, often it is able to move into a dominating position. The political role of bureaucracy varies from country to country and is intimately related to variations in political system types among the developing countries.

The immensity of the developmental problems and the urgency of their solution has in fact thrust upon the state the principal burden of accomplishing developmental goals. Despite severe handicaps like shortage of capital, skilled manpower, and lack of a developmental infrastructure, the Third World governments are confronted with rising expectations of the people they have to administer. In the early euphoria of nationalism, the people expect the government to work miracles. Besides demanding basic utilities like adequate electricity and water supply, drainage, roads and power, the government has also to cater to welfare demands like establishment of schools, hospitals, housing, and industrial enterprises. The state is expected to bring rapid socio-economic development in almost all sectors within the shortest possible time-span, an accomplishment that was gradually achieved in developed

countries of the West through private and local initiative over generations.

Further, on the debit side, the new governments are often handicapped by lack of public cooperation and participation. Public apathy may take the form of hostility to public officials, an attitude that develops from long periods of subjection to oppressive regimes. At the same time, they have to deal with social dislocations such as mass rural-urban migration, severe unemployment, riots and communal clashes, besides pressing demands for social reorganization such as land reforms, and other radical measures to promote social equity.

The importance of administration is almost universally recognised by commentators of the problems of development. Private sector may be induced to fall in line with general public policy, but the major burden of development work would naturally fall on the public sector. Hence, a high degree of public administrative efficiency is vital and necessary for the successful implementation of development plans and efforts at nation building; a fact which has now been universally acknowledged and reflected in the emergence of a new approach to administration in the developing countries known as 'development administration'.

As stated earlier, public administration becomes the main agency of socio-economic change—a change requiring not only the formulation and implementation of long term plans of industrial and agricultural development but also requiring the establishment and formation of modern institutions, organisations and skills necessary for sustaining a technological civilization which would evolve in the wake of industrialization. The challenging role of developmental administration demands three different functions :

1. Institution-building for sustaining and promoting an industrial revolution for carrying on industrial and other public utility services for the people, and for the regulation and equitable distribution of essential commodities;

2. Manpower planning and development which requires the cultivation of technical, professional and managerial skills for running new industries and public bodies. This would involve establishing institutes of technology and science;

3. Human development which would involve changing the very attitudes and temperaments of people so that they may adjust to the needs and conditions of technological change. The task of public administration is to link formal reforms with the felt needs and aspirations of the people.

However, the wider role devolved upon public administration often creates a problem of imbalance between the political wing and the administrative wing of the government. This is a situation unique

to the development process of the Third World and contrary to the one faced by the western societies during the course of their development. In western societies, the developmental process had originated from the economic sector. Economic development had given birth to a large middle class, extension of franchise, growth of political parties and trade unions, which in turn had led to the specialization of administrative organization and functions. As a result administrative development was the effect, rather than the cause of economic or political development. But due to the peculiarities of the developmental processes of the Third World societies of the twentieth century, political and socio-economic development was preceded by administrative development in these societies. The relative predominance of bureaucracy over other public institutions in these societies is a natural by-product of this imbalance of development between the bureaucratic and other non-governmental institutions.

Features of Development Administration

Though the key role of public administration in bringing about socio-economic change in developing societies is universally acknowledged, many writers have expressed their misgivings over the efficacy of the bureaucratic model of public administration in effecting rapid socio-economic change. Bureaucracy has often been portrayed as an inflexible soulless machine unsuited to the dynamic needs of social transformation. It is commonly associated with red tape, rigidity and delay in work.

Historically, it has been observed that bureaucracy antedates development administration, and does not fit in with the requirements of modernization. Conservation rather than change is the essence of bureaucracy. Culturally also the bureaucratic form of organisation does not suit the needs of the traditional societies that are currently going through a process of change. Bureaucracy has also been criticised as urban oriented and elitist in nature and unrelated to the needs of rural areas where most of the people of the developing countries live. Above all, development has been looked at as essentially a matter of shrewd political management of a society. Bureaucracy in this context has often been considered a threat to political leadership and an undesirable monopolizer of power. It has even been suggested that development calls for a degree of debureaucratization and steady institutionalization of development.[39]

In the Indian context, the role of bureaucracy in development administration has often been severely criticised. Very often

39. Mohit Bhattacharya, *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1979, p. 2.

bureaucracy has been equated with maintenance of law and order and regulatory administration. Its authoritarian and unresponsive attitude has been criticised as being a hangover of the colonial period and its suitability for developmental tasks has been questioned. Besides the structure, the behavioural patterns of bureaucrats have come in for criticism. It has been said that the elitist background of the members of the bureaucracy has resulted in their alienation from the masses and also their inability to appreciate problems of development and the needs of the rural populace. Another line of criticism has been the bureaucracy's apparent lack of commitment to development needs and programmes. Development calls for full commitment to change whereas bureaucracy has clearly stood for status-quo.

There are two schools of thought regarding the definition and scope of development administration. Montgomery and Fainsod are the exponents of the first school which defines development administration in a narrow sense. According to Fainsod, it embraces the array of new functions assumed by developing countries embarking on the path of modernization and functionalisation. Development administration ordinarily involves the establishment of a machinery for planning economic growth, and mobilizing and allocating resources to expand national income. To Montgomery, it connotes planned change in the economy or capital infrastructure and to a lesser extent in the social services, specially health and education. To this school of thought, therefore, development administration implies merely a programme and result oriented approach to administration concerned with mobilizing existing and new resources and skills to achieve developmental goals.

There is another school of thought represented by Weidner, Riggs and Pye who have used the term development administration in the widest sense. Weidner, who is one of the pioneers of the concept, defines development administration, as "the process of guiding an organization towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another."[40] If understood in this sense, development administration would include the entire process of nation-building, both in its historical perspective and in the developmental perspective of the newly emerging states of the modern world. In its latter connotation, development administration becomes an integrated concept for the study of public administration. Under this framework, past as well as present, administrative systems can be compared from the point of view of their achievement oriented goals.

40. Edward Weidner, "Development Administration—A New Focus for Research" in Heady and Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, Institute of Public Administration, Michigan, 1962, p. 98,

Whatever may be the difference in these two approaches, development administration is essentially a concept of administration which is related to change oriented administrative practices. It involves not only a study of the traditional routine type of administrative functions but is more directed towards the dynamics of change within the system with a view to judging its capacity as an instrument of developmental planning and implementation. If development administration is seen in this perspective, the difference between the two approaches is considerably reduced. For in that case, one need not necessarily confine the term to the study of administrative systems of the developing countries but also look to the systems of the developed societies with a view to assessing their capacity to promote development and social change within their societies as well.

According to Riggs, the concept of development administration has two important dimensions.[41] First, it is concerned with the processes through which a public administration system directs socio-economic and political change in the society and second, it studies the dynamics of change within the administrative system. The first refers to the "administration of development", while the second is related to the process of "administrative development." In administrative development, administration is an independent variable which can bring about political, social and economic change. In the systems model administration is viewed as a dependent variable which is affected by the environment. According to Pai Panandikar and others, development administration is marked by six defining features.[42] They are : (1) change oriented, (2) result or goal oriented, (3) citizen-participation oriented, (4) commitment to work oriented, (5) client oriented, and (6) time oriented.

Development administration in a developing country is concerned with two main dimensions of development—political and economic. The characteristics of political development, especially relevant to development administration identified by Huntington are: rationalization of public policy formulation and execution, national integration, democratization and public participation in political processes. Friedrich suggests six more features.

1. The capacity to act efficiently to cope with technological requirements of survival;

2. enforceable restraints on government;

3. operative popular participation in rule making;

41. F. W. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries*, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1964.

42. Pai Panandikar and Kshirsagar (eds.), *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, 1978.

4. existence of general rules replacing shared values and beliefs of the community;

5. a judiciary to interpret these rules and define terms of settlement; and

6. voluntary associations such as political parties, which provide alternatives to existing government, continually re-examine existing rules with public participation.[43]

The economic dimension has already been discussed elsewhere. Administrative development in developing societies has generally been defined as a pattern of increasing effectiveness to achieve prescribed policy goals. It, therefore, involves both qualitative and quantitative changes in bureaucratic policies, programmes, procedures and methods of work, organizational structures and staffing patterns, number and quality of development personnel of different types, and patterns of relations with clients of administration. Public administration in general, and development administration in particular, are closely linked to the capacity of the state to satisfy increasing developmental needs and demands of the people.

Briefly, the present and future priorities of development administration are as follows :

1. With the ever increasing functions of state, the role of administration will continue to expand in the developmental sphere. The government will become the principal planner, organizer, promoter and director of developmental efforts in all Third World countries.

2. Administrative activities will gradually become complex and technical with increasing diversification of government functions.

3. The need for planning, coordination and control of all government activities connected with development will be greater.

4. The administrative reforms and improvements in management will have to be greatly stressed.

5. Personnel structure and training will have to be geared to developmental tasks. In such a setup respect for hierarchy and a rigid application to rules and regulations at the cost of goal achievement will have no place.

6. Decision making in organisations will have to be flexible and innovative, status-consciousness in bureaucracies will have to be replaced by increasing service motivation.

7. There is need to redesign public bodies to enable collective decision-making and promote collaborative problem-solving.

---

43. See R. Brajbanti (ed.), *Political and Administrative Development*, Duke University Press, Durbam, N.C., 1969, pp. 33-34.

8. Increasing decentralisation will enable developmental agencies at field level to operate more autonomously.

9. There should be free flow of communications at all levels of the organisational pyramid.

10. There should be an adequate working partnership between the political and executive wings of the administration.

11. Commitment and dedication on the part of all engaged in developmental tasks, specially the political leadership and bureaucracy, is the first and most essential prerequisite of development administration.

12. The active participation and cooperation of the people has to be forthcoming for the success of developmental programmes.

2

ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE THEORIES

Public and Private Administration

There are two different views on the relationship between public and private administration. One group of thinkers like Urwick, Follett and Fayol are of the view that administration is an indivisible entity, and its basic principles are applicable equally to all organizations whether public or private. This view is obviously based on certain clearly observable similarities in the practice of public and private administration.

In the first place, it is extremely difficult to clearly demarcate the spheres of the two types of administrative activity. Though the activities performed by government agencies are defined as public administration, there are many private agencies which also perform tasks which are strictly public service or welfare-oriented. Conversely, there are many tasks performed by the government bureaucracy which may be of a private nature.

Secondly, methods and work procedures may be common to both public and private administration. Accounting, statistics, office management and procedures and stock taking are problems of administrative management common to both public and private administration.

With the continuous expansion of the public sector in industrial enterprises and the steady growth of public corporations, government has been drawing heavily upon the business knowledge and expertise of private administration to run these enterprises. In fact, in many countries, including India, there is a growing inter-action between the public and private sectors. In India candidates from private establishments have often been recruited to senior administrative positions in the government. Ever since private enterprises have been developing into huge administrative giants, with widening network of offices all over the country, private administration has become as impersonal as public administration. Also with the popularisation of the concept of democratic welfare

state, the principles of democratic control, public accountability and popular checks on administrative behaviour are increasing in all private organisations.

However important the similarities may be, it cannot be denied that there still remain fundamental differences between the two. The major points of difference are in the spheres of "uniformity and impartiality, responsibility, accountability and serviceability". According to Josiah Stamp the four principles which differentiate public from private administration are :

1. uniformity;
2. external financial control;
3. ministerial responsibility; and
4. marginal return.

The popular idea of public administration is that it is bureaucratic, characterized by red tape, inefficiency and inertia, whereas private administration is efficient and business-like. Following are the differences between the two types of administration.

1. Political Direction or Ministerial Responsibility : Unlike private administration, public administration is subjected to political direction in most policy matters. It is the minister who lays down broad policy outlines, under which the bureaucrat has to implement the policy. Operational autonomy is, however, granted to a great extent to public administrators, who are not responsible for their actions to the legislature. It is the minister who represents his department in the legislature, and is held responsible for all acts of omission and commission of his administrative juniors to Parliament.

2. Profit Motive or Marginal Return : Public administration is service oriented and profit-making is not its goal. A businessman will never undertake a venture which is not likely to yield any profit to him. In public administration, there is no correlation between income and expenditure, since most government departments are spending departments and even in the so-called revenue producing departments, the primary motive is always public service. Public utility services of the Government of India often run at a loss, yet the government is duty bound to spend on them.

3. Social Necessity : Public administration caters to social needs and public utilities. For example, it maintains railways to facilitate movement of goods and passengers ; the post and telegraph network facilitates communication; hospitals and dispensaries are meant to provide medical aid and public health services to the people. The scope of private administration is narrower. It is mostly concerned with providing marketable consumer goods to public, catering to the economic needs of citizens. Besides, the nature of some of the government services is so wide,

comprehensive and expensive that no private administration can undertake them, e.g., maintaining a vast network of police, army, railways or post and telegraph.

4. Public Responsibility : The public administrators are trained and duty bound to respect the wishes of the public and cater to their needs. In the words of Appleby, "Government administration differs from all other administrative work by virtue of its public nature, the way in which it is subject to public scrutiny and outcry". Private administration has no such obligation, its main objective is to secure its own ends.

5. Uniformity of Treatment : Public administration should be consistent in procedure and uniform in its public dealings. This principle is more applicable to public administration than the other, because the former is mostly regulated by common and uniform laws and regulations. Public administration is subject to the principle of external financial control. Government revenues are controlled by the people's representatives through the legislature. In private administration finances are not controlled by any outside agency.

6. Conformity to Laws and Regulations : The public administrators cannot do anything contrary to, or in excess of legal power. It has to function within the legal framework, it can never break law. If it does so, its actions can be declared invalid or, ultra-vires by the courts. Private administration has no such responsibility.

While we do admit that there are considerable differences between the two types of administration, many would agree with the conclusions of Fayol and Urwick who have said, "We are no longer confronted with several administrative sciences, but with one which can be applied equally well to public and private affairs." Public and private administration function in different environments. But despite that, differences between the two have narrowed down considerably. Prof. Waldo said :

> The generalizations which distinguish public administration from private administration, like special care for equality of treatment, legal authorization and responsibility for action, public justification or justifiability of decisions, financial probity and meticulousness, and so forth are of very limited applicability. In fact, public and private administrations are the two species of the same genus. But they have special values and techniques of their own, which give to each their distinctive character.

A Private Business Firm (Joint Stock Company)

The joint stock company is a form of business organization in which a number of people contribute their capital by purchasing

shares of the company. The work of actual management is entrusted to the salaried managers who work under the direction and supervision of the board of directors elected by the shareholders.

A joint stock company is the most important type of business organization today. It is a legal entity, distinct and separate from the shareholders who own it. As such, the company can sue and be sued. It can acquire and own property in its own name. It can produce and sell products, make contracts, incur debts, give credit to others and carry on all those functions which any other form of business organization performs.

As said above, the shareholders are the owners of the company. They elect a board of directors which takes the decisions for the company. The board of directors appoints managers and other officials and workers who perform the day-to-day work of the corporation. These managers and officials are responsible to the board of directors. Of course, the ultimate control and responsibility lies with the shareholders.

It is the shareholders who bear the risk inherent in the business. But in case of losses, they cannot be asked to pay more than the amount of shares they have purchased. In other words, their liability is limited.

The following are the main features of a joint stock company :

Accumulation of Capital by Shares : A distinctive feature of a joint stock company is that it raises capital by selling shares to public. In this way a large amount of capital is accumulated and the business can be started on a large scale.

A joint stock company can also raise capital by the issue of debentures or bonds. The debentures carry a fixed rate of interest whether or not the company earns profit. The debentures represent the loans taken by the company. The holders of debentures are the creditors of the company, while the shareholders are the owners.

Democratic Organization : Another important feature of the company is the domestic nature of its organization. The owners of the company are the shareholders. The board of directors whose duty is to run and manage the business are elected by the general body of shareholders. The important decisions regarding business are taken by the directors. They also decide the general policy of the company. But these directors are answerable to the shareholders for their decisions and policies. The general policy and the major issues concerning business are discussed in the general body meetings of the shareholders. The day-to-day work of the company is carried on by the salaried employees who are responsible to the board of directors.

Limited Liability : A very significant characteristic of the joint stock company is the limited liability of its shareholders. The

liability of a shareholder is limited to the extent of the value of the shares of the company he has purchased. In other words, in case of losses or bankruptcy, the shareholder cannot be called upon to pay more than the value of the shares he owns. Due to the limited liability, the risk undertaken by the shareholder is reduced. This has induced many people to subscribe to the share capital of the joint stock companies. As a result, it has become possible to raise large amounts of capital required for starting a big business.

Legal Entity : Another notable feature of the company is that it is a legal entity. It has a separate and distinct existence apart from the shareholders. As such, the company can sue and be sued. It conducts its business with other persons or firms under a fixed seal. It can acquire and own property, make contracts or incur debts in its own name. It is legally bound to honour the terms of contracts it makes.

Transferable Shares : The shares of a joint stock company are transferable. In other words, a shareholder can sell his shares to other people. The market in which the shares are sold and purchased is called a stock exchange or share market.

Separation of Ownership and Control: There is divorce between the ownership and control of business, that is, the performance of entrepreneurial functions is separated from ownership. The shareholders who are the owners of the corporation do not take part in the control and management of business. They elect a board of directors which controls and is responsible for the management of the company. The entrepreneurial decisions regarding price and output are taken by the directors and other salaried managers, while financial risks are borne by the shareholders.

The joint stock company has indeed become a dominant form of business organisation today. Without this form of business organization, large-scale business would not have been possible. By facilitating the accumulation of large amount of money capital and distributing the risk of production among a large number of shareholders, it has made possible the starting and running of huge companies required in fields like steel, machinery, engineering, banking, insurance, etc. It represents the typical features of a private business firm in the modern age.

Scientific Management

The first systematic theory of organization was formulated in the early years of the present century by Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915). An engineer by profession, he is regarded the father of Scientific Management. He was the first to advocate the adoption of scientific methods in the field of industrial work processes and management, to promote industrial efficiency and economy. During the later half of the nineteenth century, when

the Industrial Revolution had reached a stage of maturity, the rapid expansion of business and industry were giving rise to new problems of industrial planning and management. The working conditions in the factories were chaotic. The work methods, tools and procedures were neither standardized nor planned for efficiency. Choice of methods of work was mainly left to the workers themselves resulting in considerable ad-hoc planning and inefficiency. There was need to increase productivity which required in the long run a more rational and integrated approach to managerial problems. Rapid industrialization had given rise to a new managerial class who were being called upon to face new problems not encountered earlier. It was mainly to fulfil this need and find ways to raise industrial productivity that Taylor came out with his ideas on Scientific Management, a term coined by Loius D. Brandies first, and subsequently used by Taylor in his widely known book, the *Principles and Methods of Scientific Management*. Taylor's main thesis is that management rests upon clearly formulated laws and principles with universal applicability in all organizations which entitles it to the status of a true science.

Taylor had several objectives. He was responding to the challenges of the Industrial Revolution which necessitated optimum utilization of all available resources—human and material, in the fiercely competitive world of business and industry. The need to raise production and promote efficiency with economy in industry urgently required new techniques of management. Taylor's principles of management were "scientific" to the extent that they were based on first hand experimentation in, and observation of, work procedures and conditions in industrial enterprises.

The major goals of Scientific Management were to raise industrial output by systematic application of the methods of science, to managerial problems and work procedures, in industrial establishments. Taylor in his book made certain fundamental assumptions. They were : (a) industrial processes can be made open for scientific observation and experimentation. The work procedures of labour can be reduced to basic motions to ascertain the longest, shortest and average time needed for each motion. (b) The standard time prescribed for each operation can be produced at a designated standard of efficiency and economy. (c) The workers can be trained in the best methods for achieving the industrial objectives, by the management.

The major principles of Scientific Management are as follows :

Standardization of work methods : Taylor's first principle related to the development of a scientific method for each task which would replace ad hocism in selection of work procedures. This could be achieved, he said, by scientifically investigating the

working conditions and the total quantum of work to be undertaken in any enterprise in a given period; and then fixing daily task assignments so that the workers may work in a planned way. The goal of good management should be either higher productivity or lower unit cost. To achieve this goal, the management must pay high wages. If the output of the worker achieved an optimum level under desirable conditions, the worker should be rewarded, but conversely, if he failed in increasing his output, penalty should be imposed on him.

> It is only through enforced standardization of methods, enforced adoption of the best implements and working conditions, and enforced cooperation that this faster work can be assumed. And the duty of enforcing the adoption of standards and of enforcing this cooperation rests with the management alone. . . .[1]

Scientific selection and training of workers : Taylor's second principle related to the selection, placement and training of workers in a scientific manner. Standardization of working conditions will be crucially served by selecting and placing workers on jobs for which they are best suited by their physical and intellectual abilities. Moreover, it is the duty of the management to train workers for their tasks and provide them all facilities for development of their personalities.

Equal division of work between management and workers : Taylor's third principle was an open advocacy of an equal division of work and responsibility between management and workers. Taylor had noted in his observations the unhealthy trend of the managers to place increasing burden on the workers, while assuming for themselves only minimum responsibilities. In the context Taylor advised that half of the workers' work should be taken over by the management. The management should undertake the functions for which it was best suited, i.e., planning, organizing, controlling and determining the methods of work.

Mutual collaboration of the workers and management : The last Taylorian principle was that there should be active cooperation and cordial relations between management and workers. There should be mutual faith and trust. Efficiency and productivity can be best promoted by creating a healthy and congenial environment in the organization which is the joint responsibility of both workers and the management.

By maximizing the productive efficiency of each worker, scientific management would also maximise the earnings of

1. I.W. Taylor, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, Harper and Row, New York, 1947, p. 140.

workers and employers. Hence, all conflict between capital and labour would be resolved by the findings of science.[2]

The combination of these four principles constituted the base of scientific management. Viewed in the context of its own times, scientific management was a revolutionary concept. It brought a drastic change in the whole approach to industrial management. Through it, wastage of human and material resources was greatly minimized effecting a better and efficient utilization of labour and material. It helped in the standardization of work procedures and improvement of working conditions in factories. Labour was greatly benefited by higher wages, better placements and training, limiting of working hours and the general improvement in working facilities. The scientific management movement provided effective guidelines to the management to develop an effective organization. Taylor was the first management thinker to introduce and stress these five postulates of management—research, standards, planning, control, and mutual collaboration between labour and management. These five principles form the crux of every successful management.[3]

Commenting on the importance of scientific management for public administration Ira Skarkansky writes,

Some agencies applied its principles to mail-sorting and other such repetitious tasks. Thus, the time-motion study entered the portfolio of the public manager. In more subtle ways, the widespread adoption of 'human engineering' in private industry spread to the public sector and influenced the ways in which organizations were designed and managers trained. The principle of hierarchical management and the consequent design of government departments into neat pyramids with precise chains-of-command drew on the precepts of scientific management. Even in dealing with middle and upper level government administrators, there was acceptance of Taylor's view of an organization's member as a pliable instrument who would, given appropriate material inducement, perform the assigned tasks. The employee was not seen as a variable personality having needs, preferences, attitudes, and commitments, all of which must be considered by the organization's leaders. Those who designed government departments and trained their managers were concerned with 'span of control' (i.e., how many subordinates a manager could supervise) and with other principles of the 'one best way' for management; each subordinte should have a single superior; there should be no division of responsibility. These principles were far

2. Reinhard Bendix, *Work and Authority in Industry*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1956, pp. 274-5.

3. Shim Shun Nisa, Ali, *Eminent Administrative Thinkers*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1984, pp. 17-26.

too simple to be actually supportive of precise recommendations. To the credit of their creators, however, it must be said that the special studies undertaken to investigate departments did recognize that subtle forces (many of them 'political') operate in and around public bureaucracies.[4]

In the early years of the 20th century, scientific management had a snowballing impact on administrative thought and practice in the United States. It permeated not only industrial enterprises and business establishments, but also government organizations. In 1910, the scientific management movement manifested itself in the establishment of the Commission on Economy and Efficiency under President Taft. The recommendations of this commission further popularized the scientific management movement. Later, President Woodrow Wilson, who was an advocate of administrative efficiency through the democratic credo and civil service reform, tried to harmonize efficiency with democratic principles of government. Taylor's advocacy of the one best way to do each work—productive or managerial—was equally implemented in industrial and governmental business and management. Thus the scientific technology of Taylorism, besides the democratic principle, comprised the twin elements of American public administration.

The popularity and impact of the scientific management movement can be further gauged from the fact that it gained considerable significance in industrial management in the Soviet Union. Lenin had exhorted Russian industrial managers, as early as 1920, to apply the principles of scientific management for increasing production. Throughout the 1930's and 1940's great efforts were made to increase the productivity and efficiency in Soviet industries through the application of the principles of scientific management.

The scientific management movement aroused much criticism and apprehensions in various quarters. It has been alleged that the movement was mainly concerned with organizational efficiency viewed in purely mechanistic terms. Labour's opposition to Taylorism led to an investigation by Prof. Robert Hoxie on behalf of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations. The major criticism of Hoxie was that the basic ideals of scientific management and trade unionism were incompatible. Scientific management concerned itself mainly with production, efficiency and managerial problems, without touching on the psychological and emotional problems of workers—the routine and monotony of their work, uncertainty of employment etc.

Sam Lewisohn and Oliver Sheldon, both management thinkers also criticized certain aspects of Taylor's work. Sheldon stressed

4. Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration Policy Making in Government Agencies*, 1978, p. 199.

the human aspects of managerial problems, whereas Lewisohn emphasized the maintenance of good human relations in an organization. The worker, according to Lewisohn wanted justice, status and opportunity above everything else, and hence simply a rise in wages will not automatically lead to added efficiency.

The above factors will also have to be taken into account to keep labour happy and motivated towards the organizational goals. Miss M.P. Follett, a contemporary of Taylor and a well known administrative thinker, also stressed the need to bridge the gap between the mechanistic approach of Taylor and the approach emphasizing human relations in organizations.

The general allegation that Taylor had neglected the human factor in management led to a series of psychological and sociological studies with special reference to this factor. The Hawthorne experiment (1927-32) and post-World War II researches in group dynamics and human relations in industry helped in establishing to a great extent that psychological and emotional factors were no less important than economic in explaining workers' behaviour and determining organizational output and efficiency.

However, the significance and importance of the theory of scientific management cannot be underestimated by the above criticisms. Its true worth can be measured by the growth of a science of management through the application of scientific methods. It would be important to remember that in Taylor's work the human relations aspect of organizations was underemphasized but certainly not entirely neglected. As stated earlier, he recognized the importance of mutual collaboration of workers and management as one of the essential principles for raising industrial efficiency. Besides, improvement of the working conditions of labour was his chief concern. One of the main by-products of Taylorism was that workers came to be paid and trained better, besides working in more congenial conditions than before. Nevertheless, it was gradually realized that a mechanical application of Taylor's principles and methods in industry and government without taking into account other relevant factors would not necessarily result in higher efficiency or productivity. However, the essence of his theory that the speed, cost and quality of goods and services were dependent variables, and that they could be maximized by the adjustment of independent variables such as division of labour, method of supervision, financial incentives, flow of materials and, lastly, physical methods and condition are still true to a great extent.

Classical Theory

The classical theory of organization is also known as the structural theory and its foremost proponents have been Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick, L.F. Urwick, J.D. Mooney, A.C. Reiley, M.P. Follett and R. Shelton.

The most important concern of the classical theory is the formulation of certain universal principles of organization. It deals primarily with formal organizational structure. The theory assumes that there are certain fundamental principles on the basis of which an organization can be established to achieve a specific objective. The watchwords of this approach are efficiency and economy, as it conceives that these principles, if fully adopted, can lead to maximum organizational efficiency and economy. The structuralists were chiefly concerned with discovering the true basis on which work can be divided in an organization and devising proper methods of bringing about effective organizational coordination.

Henri Fayol (1841-1925) observed that management was an undertaking common to all human activities. He enunciated certain basic concepts and principles of management and viewed management as a teachable theory dealing with planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling work processes. Fayol's is often considered the first complete theory of management. Fayol was primarily concerned with the job of the chief executive and pinned his faith in the principle of unity of command. Fayol divided all activities in an organization under six groups : technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting and administrative. In his book, *General and Industrial Administration,* he propounded fourteen principles of organization listed below :

1. Division of work
2. Authority
3. Discipline
4. Unity of command
5. Unity of direction
6. Subordination of individual interest to general interest
7. Remuneration of personnel
8. Centralization
9. Scalar chain
10. Order
11. Equity
12. Stability of tenure of personnel
13. Initiative
14. *Esprit de corps*

Mooney and Reiley's *Onward Industry* is a pioneering work on the development of organizational theory and is considered the first coherent approach to find organization universals. Mooney argued that all organization structures are based on a system of superior-subordinate relationships arranged in a hierarchical order. This, he termed as "Scalar principles". According to this principle in every organization there is a grading of duties in

varying degrees of authority and corresponding responsibility. The scalar chain constitutes the universal process of coordination, through which the supreme coordinating authority becomes effective throughout the entire structure. The scalar process has its own principle, process and effect. These they term as leadership, delegation and functional definition.[5]

Other notable thinkers of the classical school are Luther Gulick and Syndall Urwick. Gulick defines major managerial techniques by the word POSDCORB. Each letter of the word stands for a different technique such as planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting.

The classical thinkers perceive organization as a formal structure of plan created in accordance with certain accepted principles. In the words of L.D. White,

> It is a formal declared pattern of relationships established in government by law and by top management. It is based on the nature and volume of work to be done and is dictated by the requirements of efficiency in the sense of securing the most effective use of men and materials and by the need for responsibility.[6]

This theory is marked by four features—impersonality, specialisation, efficiency and hierarchy.

An important contribution of the classical theorists in general is their attempt to find certain universal principles of organization. It instilled a sense of purpose and increased coordination of administrative operations and by specification of roles, brought more predictability and stability in organizational behaviour. However, the classical theorists are criticised on the ground that each "principle" has been proved to be neither empirically valid in organizational functioning nor universally applicable which has led Herbert Simon to dub them as "proverbs".[7] Another criticism often levelled is the classicists' lack of behavioural analysis and neglect of the human factor in administration. Their methods tend to be prescriptive rather than descriptive. They are also accused of a pro-management bias with over-emphasis on the formal structure rather than the informal aspects of organizational dynamics. The theory is marked by an undue concern for the problems of the structure in relation to roles. Stress is laid not on human beings (role occupants) as such, but on the role as it relates to other roles in the broader context of organizational goals. It is

5. James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, *The Principles of Organisation*, Harper and Row, New York, 1967, pp. 14-24.
6. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, Macmillan, New York, 1958, pp. 26-27.
7. Herbert Simon, *Administrative Behaviour*, 1957, pp. 20-36.

atomistic and voluntaristic in the sense that it fails to view individuals from an integrated perspective, i.e., it ignores the 'social' aspect of man and the influence of the social environment on his work. The classical theory treats organization as a closed system completely unconnected with, or uninfluenced by the external environment. Its obsession with the normative aspect of the functioning of organizations leads to its neglect of the study of actual and informal behavioural patterns in the formal organizational structure.

Human Relations Theory

The essence of the human relations theory lies in its primary emphasis on human beings, psychological motivations and informal group behaviour—in contradistinction to the structuralists' exclusive concern for principles of organization.

This theory or approach focuses on management as a web of interpersonal relationships. It lays greater stress on the behaviour of role occupants in an organization than on the formal structure of the organization. The advocates of this school argue that since management and administration involve group effort and collective endeavours of people, the study of management must be centred on interpersonal relations. The scholars of this school highlight the individual as a socio-psychological being and are more concerned with his motivations. They view human relations as the heart of the task of management; others equate management with leadership. The underlying emphasis of all these views is that the solution of the problems of management can be found in the realm of social psychology.

The greatest single influence of the human relations theory came from the Hawthorne experiments which were carried out in the USA by Elton Mayo and his colleagues of the Harvard Business School in the late twenties and early thirties of this century. The findings were first published in *Management and the Worker* (F.J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson) in 1939. The Hawthorne studies carried out at the Western Electric Company at Hawthorne in the USA is a historic landmark in organizational theory, since it helped to develop the Human Relations School of Organization. The immediate objective of the study was to measure the effect of improved lighting on workers' output, and the psychological and social problems of industrial workers.

Some of the startling findings of the Hawthorne experiments are discussed below. In the first experiment workers operating under a piece-rate system were observed to see whether higher wages motivated them to work more. The researchers were considerably surprised to find that the workers worked to a point they felt would ensure them of an adequate income, and then refused to work more, thus giving a lie to a well known Taylorian

principle.   The main reason for this unexpected behaviour was the underlying fear that overproduction may lead to retrenchment, a situation which any of them might have to face.   The researchers discovered that the workers were a well-knit social group who were governed by their own code of work ethics informally agreed to by all members.

In another experiment, some female workers were isolated from   the   rest and placed under observation.   Their level of productivity under diverse working conditions   were   carefully measured.   But under all physical changes in their work environment (like less or more room lighting, rest pauses in work etc.), the production of these girls showed a continually upward rise.   This proved that there was no positive correlation between the working conditions and productivity, invalidating another Taylorian dictum which greatly puzzled researchers.   However, the reason for the behaviour of the female workers seemed hardly surprising on further analysis. The girls were conscious of the fact that they had been selected for a special experiment.   Hence, it was little wonder that they tried to give their best performance.

The Hawthorne experiments proved that men are not atomistic or voluntaristic creatures, but are motivated by a variety of factors (not purely economic) in work, and are influenced by their social environment.   These studies proved that organizations are social systems comprising thinking and acting individuals. It further disclosed the tendency of workers to form small informal social groups with their own code of ethics and conduct in matters of work, behaviour, beliefs and goals which may be often different from the goals of management and the stated objectives of the organization.

The human relations theory of organization rejects formal institutionalization. It considers the informal, day-to-day functioning of the structure more revealing than the mechanistic study of structure and principles of organization. It assumes that the study of organizational behaviour is a very complex process which has to take into account, both the economic and non-economic variables. For a realistic analysis of workers' behaviour, all the factors motivating them have to be studied. White remarks,

> It is the set of work relationships that grow out of the mutual interactions of persons working together over a long period of time.   The informal organization is more subtle, reflecting such matters as social and economic status, race or language differences, educational levels, and personal likes and dislikes. The formal organization tends to be relational and impersonal, than informal, emotional and personal.   The two usually overlap, may nearly coincide, or may be far apart.[8]

8.   L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, p. 27.

Some important thinkers of the humanistic school are Robert K. Merton, F.J. Roethlisberger, Alex Bavelas, Keith Davis, A.H. Maslow, D. Cartwright, Leonard Sayles and Chris Argyris. Humanists lay greater emphasis on the study of major psychological processes such as perception, learning and motivation which reveal a worker's personality more than other mechanical factors.

Roethlisberger in his book *Management and Morale* argues that organization is essentially a conglomeration of small working groups. Inter and intra-personal relations within and between groups are determined by various social and psychological factors. Every worker is both a social and an economic being. Therefore, any technical change in the work environment of a worker affects not only his economic but his total social status as well, and his reaction to it may vary accordingly.

According to Merton if the bureaucracy is to be functional it must attain a high degree of behavioural predictability or a high degree of conformity with prescribed patterns of action. Our understanding of the social structure has been considerably increased by empirical studies like Merton's which focussed on the interactions of bureaucracy and personality. Chris Argyris contends that the 'classical' school places the worker in a situation which affords him little opportunity for psychological gratification or job satisfaction, such is the dullness and repetitive nature of an average worker's work.

Other notable contributions to the Human Relations School are Keith Davis's *Human Relations at Work*, Alex Bavelas's *Leadership : Man and Function*, A.H. Maslow's, *A Theory of Human Motivation*, Leonard Sayles's *The Change Process in Organization*.

It is important to note that the early theories of Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson were criticised for underestimating the scope of worker-management conflict or even labour unrest. They were termed anti-union and their theories were allegedly misused by managers to exploit the working class. As a consequence, the later human relation theorists such as Argyris and Bennis have stressed the significance of "fusion" approach, where the individual worker in an organization is considered as important as the organization itself. Organizational goals were deemed as important as goals of individual workers. Every effort should be made to see that the organizational work fulfils the worker's talent and creative potential and leaves him satisfied with his job. It is the goal of every management to strike a balance between the workers' needs and those of the organization.

Comparison Between Classical and Human Relations Theory

Although the Human Relationists and the Classical Theorists

are generally considered antithetical in their approach to organizational dynamics, it is interesting to note that there is a significant similarity in the views of both regarding the objectives of an organization. In both theories, the goals remain the same, viz., economy, efficiency, and the use of scientific methods in management. The former's conceptualization was based on the recognition of the motivation of a "social man" who was emotional while the latter's focus was on the needs of an "economic man" who was rational and logical. The classicists focussed on the motivations of workers, while human relationists examined the needs and aspirations of workers as well as managers. The former's prescription of organizational change lay in the realm of formal structure while the latter recognized that it is the informal group in an organization which primarily determines the nature of change. Despite these differences both have played a major role in developing administrative thought and practice. The classical theory played a notable role in rationalizing and stimulating the quality and quantity of production. By formulating certain concepts in administration it evolved a base for subsequent research in organizational theory. The human relation theorists started where the former left off; their emphasis on the variables of leadership, morale, motivation, informal groups and the external as well as the internal environment of organization in relation to the personality of workers paved the way for a new orientation in administrative studies, based on the empirical and behavioural approach. Further, their stress on the concept of organization as a system of interrelated parts and functioning in a dynamic environment acted as a precursor to the systemic-ecological approaches to the field of scientific-administrative studies.

Difference Between Formal and Informal Organization

As stated earlier, the classical school emphasizes the formal structure and principles of an organization, rather than the informal group behaviour in any organization stressed by the human relationists. The human relations theory goes beyond the formal institutionalization of an organization to concern itself with the human motivations and the informal behind-the-scenes group functioning of the structure. It believes that a worker is a 'social' being, who does not act or react in a vacuum moved by only mechanical or economic considerations. There are a variety of influences motivating his behaviour and to understand him, it is necessary to understand his environment and these influences. The formal organization, its structure and principles, is generally documented in charts and handbooks of the organization. The informal organization is customary in nature; it refers to the whole pattern of actual work behaviour and interpersonal relations that affect decisions within the organization but may be formally absent or inconsistent with the formal plan or structure. In the words of L.D. White,

The informal organization is more reflecting of such matters as social and economic status, race or language differences, educational levels, and personal likes and dislikes. The formal organization tends to be relational and impersonal; the informal, emotional and personal. The two usually overlap, may nearly coincide, or may be far apart.[9]

Formal organization is the planned structure ; it corresponds to a formal design. By contrast, informal organization is a natural growth, which may or may not coincide with the formal model of organization. Central to the distinction between formal and informal organization is the difference between authority and influence. Authority is the legitimate exercise of power over others whereas influence is the informal capacity over others to get things done.

All organizations have both a formal design without and informal patterns of influence within, which may not coincide for various reasons; like the difference between the relative strength and capacity of those exercising authority and influence or the various elements in the organizational environment which make it relatively easier or more difficult in exercising so. Procedural coordination—the specification of the lines of authority and the spheres of activity and authority of each organization member—creates a formal organization, a set of abstract, more or less permanent relations that govern the behaviour of each participant ....Relationships based on influence result from the interplay of a combination of factors. Some are unique to the particular scene; but others are recurringly characteristic of many agencies and situations.

Informal groupings and interpersonal relations and personal associations result in parallel sources of influence in the formal organization. There are always certain members who by their proximity to strategic post-holders in the organization manage to exercise a lot of influence. Like the men behind the throne, all departmental heads have their 'caucus'. Factions of all sorts are fairly common in public organizations, each faction having some membership and influence. Employee welfare unions, specially among lower grade staff, may often determine unofficial standards of conduct and discipline which the senior officials by mere authority may find difficult to change.

However, it must be stated that these two approaches are not mutually exclusive but rather supplement each other. There can be no informal organization without a formal one, from where the former can operate. Informal organization is a self-evident fact and a functional necessity, which no formal structure can

9. *Ibid.*

completely choose to ignore. However, the formal structure is the basis on which an organization can start to operate and subsequently provides it with the stability and precision required for smooth production processes. Every organization has to operate within a normative framework of structure, objectives, principles and goals. But since the organization comprises men and not machines only, an informal interpersonal style of functioning (the human touch) will inevitably emerge which will be flexible and changeable in nature. The formal organization theory gives only a partial and incomplete picture of organizational dynamics. The complete picture of an organization emerges only when the formal theory is supplemented with the informal. Undue emphasis on one will lead to a distorted view of organizational reality and undermining of the advantages of both.

The human relations approach filled in the gaps of the classical approach, and corrected its one-sidedness but in the process could not avoid the pitfalls of becoming an equally one-sided theory on its own. Therefore, neither of the two is a complete theory. With their opposing emphases they very well supplement and correct each other. For a student of public administration the best course would be to read the two theories in conjunction with each other to get as near a picture of the total organizational reality as is possible by the present stage of knowledge of organizational dynamics.

Bureaucratic Theory

Bureaucracy as an organisational model was first developed systematically by Max Weber, an eminent German sociologist, in the nineteenth century. According to him, every organization can be defined as a structure of activities (means) directed towards the achievement of certain objectives (ends). To maximize efficiency and productivity every organisation develops a system of specialisation (division of tasks) and a set of systematic rules and procedures. Weber stressed that the bureaucratic form is capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency, and is in this sense, formally, the most rational known means of carrying out control over human beings in any organization. It is superior to every other form in precision, stability, discipline and reliability.[10]

Elaborating this point Weber wrote :

The development of the modern form of organisation of corporate groups in all fields is nothing less than identical with the development and continual spread of bureaucratic administration. This is true of church and state, of armies, political

10. Max Weber, "The Essentials of Bureaucratic Organisation : An Ideal Type Construction", in R.K. Merton; et. al. (ed.), *Reader in Bureaucracy*, The Free Press, New York, 1952, p. 24.

parties, economic enterprises, organisations to promote all kinds of causes, private associations, clubs, and many others. For bureaucratic administration is, other things being equal, always from a formal, technical point of view, the most rational type. For the needs of mass administration today, it is completely indispensable.[11]

Weber tried to identify the various factors and the conditions that have contributed to the growth of bureaucracy in modern times. The development of modern large scale organizations and corporations has led to the development and considerable spread of bureaucracy in organisations. Whatever may be the evils of bureaucracy, it is simply indispensable for the running of complex administrative structures. Secondly, an important factor responsible for the superiority of bureaucratic organisation is the role of expanding technical knowledge, and the development of modern technology. Whether the economic system is capitalistic or socialistic, a considerable degree of bureaucratic specialization is required to attain a high level of organizational efficiency. Thirdly, Weber repeatedly stressed the fact that the capitalist system has undeniably played a major role in the development of modern bureaucracy. The proper functioning of a capitalist system necessitates a stable state and a well organized administration. Besides, capitalism is considered the most rational economic basis for bureaucratic administration itself.

The bureaucratic form of organization, according to Weber, is distinguished by the following structural and behavioural characteristics :

Division of labour : This involves a specified sphere of competence which has been marked off as part of a systematic division of labour in the organisation. Each office holder is the incumbent of an office as long as he holds it, but he cannot personally own the office or the means of production and administration. His job placement is based on his qualifications and/or special training.

Hierarchy : Hierarchy is the second fundamental characteristic which is the feature of any bureaucratic form of organization. There is a clear separation between superior and subordinate offices, i.e., each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one. Remuneration is fixed in accordance with the nature of the job and the grade of responsibility. Promotion and career advancement is on the basis of seniority and merit.

Rules : Thirdly, bureaucracy operates in accordance with a consistent system of abstract rules laid down regarding the performance of official jobs. The role of rules has been stressed by Weber

---

11. Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*, The Free Press, New York, 1964, p. 337.

so that personal favouritism, arbitrariness or nepotism may not hinder the working of an organization. Every act of personal discretion of officials must be justified by impersonal ends.

The set of behavioural characteristics can be described as follows :

Rationality :   Weber's ideas on efficiency and rationality are closely related to his ideal typical model of bureaucracy. He observed that bureaucracy is the most rational known means of a$_t$chieving imperative control over human beings. It is capable of a taining a high degree of efficiency since the means used to achieve goals are rationally and objectively chosen towards the desired ends. An added factor of efficiency is that personal whims of the leaders and traditional pressures are no longer effective in such a system; it is run according to rules and there is a clearer demarcation between personal and official affairs. Rationality is also reflected by the relatively easier means of calculability of results in the organisation.

Impersonality :   The bureaucratic form has no place for personal whims, fancies or irrational sentiments. Official activity is conducted in a business-like manner with a high degree of operational impersonality.

Rule orientation :   Rationality and impersonality are mainly achieved through formulation of rules and procedures which clearly define official spheres of authority and conduct, which the employees are to rigidly maintain in discharging their duties.

Neutrality :   Bureaucracy is supposed to be apolitical and neutral in its orientation and support to the political regime it serves. It is also value-neutral committed only to the work it is meant to perform.

Criticism :   The bureaucratic theory of organization is criticised along several lines.

Weber's ideal has evoked much criticism of his statement that a bureaucratic type of organization is, at least from a technical angle, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency. Behavioural theorists such as Herbert Simon and Chester Barnard have emphasized the point that administrative efficiency would be reduced by following Weber's structural approach and that efficiency in an organization could be increased through informal organizations and better human relations.[12] Gouldner, who has tested Weber's ideal-type empirically, found that the Weberian model has internal contradictions which are reflected in the tensions between the claims of expertise and the claims of obedience based

12.   Peter M. Blau, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, Random House, New York, 1962, p. 36.

on discipline.[13'] To enable a bureaucrat to function successfully, it is necessary to give him maximum operational freedom. Weber has also been criticised for not paying adequate attention in his theory to human behaviour, relations, morale and motivational factors. His theory has been called a 'machine-theory' and a closed system model overemphasizing the formal rational aspects of bureaucracy while ignoring the whole range of socio-cultural environment and behavioural characteristics of large formal organizations.

According to Laski, bureaucracy is characterised by a passion for routine in administration, the sacrifice of flexibility to rule, delay in the making of decisions and a refusal to embark upon experiments. In his *New Despotism*, Lord Hewart argued that citizen rights and liberties are now in jeopardy because the typical bureaucrat has lately come to exercise a lot of discretionary power which is strictly against the principles of democratic administration. It has grown and developed under the cloak of ministerial responsibility. Max Weber has himself stated that "bureaucracy is the means of carrying 'community action' over into rationally ordered 'societal action'. Therefore, as an instrument for 'socializing' relations of power, bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order. . . ."

R.K. Merton has argued that bureaucracy as an organizational form is characterized by rigidity, over-emphasis on rules and regulations rather than on goals and objectives, and marked by lack of public relations and class consciousness on the part of bureaucrats.

Lloyd and Susanne Rudolph have argued that the Weberian model is not necessarily the most rational and effective organizational structure in terms of efficiency. They state,

Formal rationality (and technology) can contribute to organizational efficiency, but can also contribute to organisational ineffectiveness by building up the sources of alienation and resistance, and fuelling the struggle of power against authority. The persistence or retention of patrimonial elements in bureaucratic administration can mitigate if not eliminate the struggle just as the presence of bureaucratic features in patrimonial administration can (and did) enhance its efficiency and effectiveness.[14]

Besides identifying the role of bureaucracy in a democratic government, Weber also analyzed the possible ill-effects a bureaucratic system could have on the functioning of a democratic order.

13. Ferrel Heady and Stokes (eds.), *Papers on Comparative Public Administration*, University of Michigan Press, 1962, p. 72.

14. Lloyd I. Rudolph, and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, 'Authority and Power in Bureaucratic and Patrimonial Administration : A Revisionist Interpretation of Weber on Bureaucracy," *World Politics*, January 1979.

He noted that permanent officials may be inclined often to misuse their authority. Bureaucratization which tends to concentrate power in the hands of an administrative elite militates against the principles of democracy. But on the other hand, he also realized that without a rationally selected administrative class, democracy will be plagued by the evils of a spoils system (nepotism and patronage), which in the long run, leads to public waste, corruption, red-tapism and inefficiency.

The Weberian model, the critics point out, can best function in a stable environment with routine and repetitive tasks. Its capacity for adaptation to change is rather limited. The model is dysfunctional in terms of development and also in terms of jobs involving innovation and creativity. In the developing countries where rapid change is required to bring about socio-economic transformation, the traditional structure of bureaucracy is ill-equipped to meet the tasks it is called upon to perform. Its limitations in performing developmental tasks have often been pointed out. The bureaucratic model is too rigid and inflexible to suit dynamic-change oriented situations. As Trist comments,

> The nineteenth century cannot be repeated in developing countries in the last third of the twentieth. A fallacy is to suppose that large-scale organisations in these countries must, initially at least, be regimentally constructed in the bureaucratic mode that is beginning to decline in the advanced countries. Evidence is mounting that the pre-industrial traditions of many developing countries enable transbureaucratic styles to be learnt more quickly than in some advanced countries where a great deal of unlearning must first take place.[15]

Other writers on bureaucracy, like Presthus, have also opined that the Weberian model is a product of an alien culture which is fairly inadequate for imposition in the developing societies. A study of the interaction between the administrative culture and the social environment in India makes it clear that the bureaucratic behaviour is more a product of past historic-colonial legacy than of a rationally ordered developed society as said in the Weberian model. Much of the bureaucratic behaviour tends to be dysfunctional, marked in terms of developmental goals by rigidity, red-tape and formalism rather than goal orientedness.

Social scientists like Warren Bennis have also predicted that the bureaucratic form is outmoded and is likely to disappear in the new developing societies. According to him, every age evolves its own typical organizational form which becomes extinct with time and bureaucracy; having outlived its utility in the present age it

15. Mohit Bhattacharya, *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, Uppal Publishing House, New Delhi, 1979, p. 7.

will be replaced by a more adaptable and appropriate form of organization suited to contemporary needs.

The concept of bureaucracy has been criticised as being "the product of a specific historical, social and political milieu". To overcome the shortcomings of the bureaucratic model, Riggs introduced his ecological model of public administration. He observes that Weber's ideal type construct of bureaucracy assumes a relatively autonomous administrative system and thus is not particularly relevant to the study of developing societies. In developing countries, the administrative structures do not enjoy sufficient autonomy from other social structures whereas in developed societies they are comparatively more autonomous. Further, in developing countries the administrative structures become multifunctional and are likely to perform a variety of "extra-administrative functions" besides the strictly "administrative". In the fluid environments of transitional developing societies it is difficult to study the administrative sub-systems on the basis of ideal type constructs of Weber. Riggs thus points out the need for developing new conceptual constructs to study such societies which have a mixture of the primitive and the modern.

Conclusion : The bureaucratic theory of organization has served a useful purpose in history by helping to develop professionalism in administration by incorporating rationalist ethics and standards of conduct and business. It helped to evolve a modernist administrative culture from the earlier feudal remnants of a corrupt, authoritarian and unresponsive administrative ethos based on the spoils and patronage system. It, therefore, was a progressive and useful model of organization at one time. Much of the criticisms of the bureaucratic model generally emanate from Weber's ideal type construct. It is necessary to understand that Weber wanted to construct an "ideal type" or a "pure" model of bureaucracy which obviously cannot be approximated to reality. Weber was not a champion of the bureaucratic order, in fact he was more than sufficiently aware of the evils of "bureaucratization." He had merely stated that compared to the then prevailing administrative forms, bureaucracy was more capable of operating with greater efficiency and rationality.

Weberian Model of Bureaucracy and Development Administration

The present century has witnessed remarkable changes in almost all facets of human life under the impact of science and technology but there is no relevant change in the operational style of bureaucracy in response to such changes. It still projects its classical image which is based on the bureaucratic theory of organisation propounded by Max Weber. The bureaucracy as an organisational model has shown remarkable resilience to change in keeping with the changes in the environment in which it functions. This problem has now assumed great significance in the

context of the structural and attitudinal changes required in the bureaucracy in conformity with the changing socio-political and economic environment of transitional societies. In these societies, the state has assumed the responsibility of multifaceted development, and the bureaucracy has assumed the role of a key partner in initiating and implementing programmes of nation building and socio-economic progress.

In Weber's ideal type construct, authority in the bureaucratic organisation inheres in the office and not in the particular person who happens to be the office holder at any given period of time. This stress on depersonalisation of office is reflected in the bureaucrat's trained impersonality since functionaries are supposed to minimize personal relations and resort to detached work procedures. In such an approach the peculiarities of individual cases are often ignored which tend to produce conflict in the bureaucratic contacts with the public or the clientele.[16] Thus the concept of an impersonal order has within it the seeds of latent conflict between the officials and the public. In fact, it is greatly dysfunctional to the emerging concept of human relations oriented administration and harmful to the interests of a developing nation.

The concept of impersonality may bring a rigid rule oriented approach which is the very opposite of commitment now regarded as an essential prerequisite for development administration.[17]

Secondly, in this model, the organization of official functions is bound by rules. Rules provide stability and continuity to an organization but as Merton observes, "Adherence to the rules, originally conceived as a means, becomes transformed into an end-in-itself; there occurs the familiar process of displacement of goals whereby an instrumental value becomes a terminal one". In achieving developmental tasks, very often new rules have to be framed or old ones modified to suit the changed conditions of society. In case rules are outdated or static, they will tend to become dysfunctional to development. A rigid application of old rules will promote an element of conservatism in bureaucracy. In the changing set up of developing societies rule application should be rational and dynamic which requires special training on the part of bureaucrats.

Thirdly, according to Weber, bureaucracy functions according to a strict division of labour based on specified spheres of competence and authority which should be clearly demarcated in every organisation. A clear-cut carving out of a sphere of competence of a particular administrative branch or division helps to avoid overlapping or confusion. But in the context of development

16. Merton, et. al., *Reader in Bureaucracy*, p. 368.
17. See A.V. Satyanarayan Rao, "Weberian Model of Bureaucracy and Development Administration" in Avasthi and Arora (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Development : Indian Perspectives*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi, 1978, pp. 1-8.

administration, the rigid application of this principle may lead to considerable delay in getting things done. Development administration throws numerous new challenges in the sphere of administration and the administrator is expected to perform as he thinks fit in any new situation that may develop in his sphere of authority. Strict adherence to this norm will only lead to red-tapism, shirking of responsibility and delay in programme implementation. What is required is a flexible approach to the division of tasks at all levels, keeping in view the need to meet any emergency as and when it arises.

Fourthly, under the Weberian model, the organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy, that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one. The criterion of hierarchy, it has been stated, is more appropriate to a centralised administrative system than to a democratically decentralised system. In developing countries, the government has become a multipurpose agency employing a number of technocrats and specialists in its numerous branches, divisions and bodies. If all these agencies were to be placed in strict hierarchical order, it would lead to tricky problems of generalist-specialist relationships regarding placement in the hierarchy, which may result in considerable heartburning on the part of both. Further, a rigid adherence to the hierarchical principle does not contribute to the feeling of mutual trust, either in the inter-organizational relations, or in the inter-personal relations in the administration. In a developing country all agencies and officials of the government should consider themselves active participants and co-partners in the development process rather than parts of a hierarchical ladder they have to climb.

Weber's ideal type model advocates the separation of administrative staff from ownership of the means of production or administration. It makes a complete distinction between the office and the office holder, thereby stressing the fact that personal and public ends are distinct and have separate spheres. This view was necessary to a great extent to check corruption and to explain the main difference between private and public administration. However, it is not enough to formulate a code of conduct for bureaucrats, to check corruption. It is more necessary to examine the cause of the malady which has assumed alarming proportions in developing countries, and try to strike at the roots.

Another postulate of the Weberian model is that administrative acts, decisions and rules should all be recorded in writing, in order to help public accountability of administration and to make administrative transactions more scientific and professional. But unfortunately in the context of developing countries, this has only given way to rule-orientation, and excessive formalization of the official work greatly impeding efficiency in an organization.

Too much documentation not only results in procedural delay but also makes it difficult to discriminate between important matters. Stress should be more on performance rather than procedures and file work in the administration of development projects and programmes.

Commenting on the special characteristics of a development bureaucracy Ghildyal writes :

Bureaucracy for development tends to be characterized by flexibility (even expediency) in place of excessive emphasis on rationality. It reflects a sense of commitment in terms of convictions and enthusiasm instead of impersonality and chilling neutrality conveying lack of interest. It represents a sense of social equality instead of ascribed respect to positions in hierarchy and rank-consciousness which generates sycophancy and flattery. It places premium on professionalism and authority of competence in place of authority and legitimacy of position in the hierarchy. It acknowledges authority of the situation and it may even tend to develop a sense of ad hocism in place of predictability of patterns of behaviour. It fosters a sense of permissiveness and accessibility of the top brass of administration and tears off the executive mask of aloofness of those in the higher echelons of the pyramid. It also encourages and fosters communicability and openness of communication and consultation in inter-personal relationships in place of secrecy because developmental processes thrive on democratic traditions. Democracy distributes power by changing the loci of power rather than by concentrating it at some focal points. Delegation, therefore, becomes the hallmark of developmental bureaucracy, just as coordination and teamwork are its essence in implementation.[18]

---

18.   U.C. Ghildyal, "Bureaucracy in a Developing Society" in Avasthi and Arora (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Development : Indian Perspectives*", p. 22.

3

ADMINISTRATION, POLITY AND SOCIETY

Interaction with Historical and Political Legacies

The character of modern administration has been greatly moulded by much expansion in the functions of modern states.

The factors which taken together gave rise to 'Big Government' also contributed to the establishment of the 'administrative state' in almost every developed and developing country of the world. The government formulates public policies and depends on the public administration for their implementation. In modern states bureaucracy performs multiple functions. Besides, performing the older regulatory functions which were mostly preventive, and coercive in nature (maintenance of law and order, collection of revenue, defending the state against aggression), they now render various services to the people. Provision of modern amenities of life, education, health, employment and improved means of transportation are some of the important tasks of socio-economic transformation undertaken by newly created departments of government everywhere, specially in the developing countries of the Third World.

In these countries the bureaucracy for historical reasons, being more articulate and well developed than other social structures is in a better position to assume key responsibility for socio-economic change. Therefore, despite various alternatives which are often floated from time to time the public bureaucracy, retains the central place in the politico-administrative system due to its "homogeneity, large numbers and professional competence."

Most of the Third World countries face the common problems of moving towards the twin goals of nation-building and rapid socio-economic progress. They are caught up in a whirlpool of rapid change and an upsurge of rising expectations which create tremendous pressure on the governments to bring about an all round development and modernization of all sectors of administration, polity and society. Though various Third World

countries have adopted varying strategies of development, there are certain common elements in their politics of development. The major elements are : (i) a widely shared consensus on the goals of development ; (ii) a high degree of reliance on the government for achieving the developmental objectives ; (iii) wide prevalence of primordial over national loyalties ; (iv) oft-recurring political unrest and instability ; (v) existence of a modern political elite ; and (vi) uneven growth of political structure and the bureaucracy among those in the more developed category.

Developmental goals and the urgency with which they are sought to be achieved inevitably calls for vigorous state action as the principle instrument of social transformation. Neither time nor means is available for experimentation with slow and gradual progress in the western pattern of development with private enterprise as the main vehicle of change. The political authority with its power and resources almost automatically assumes a position of pivotal importance in the developmental process of the Third World.

To become an agent of change, public bureaucracy must have the potential to give direction and dynamism to the pace of change and have the capacity to adapt itself to changes demanded or planned by the political authority and also initiate its own changes, where needed. In other words, public administration should undergo structural and attitudinal changes to develop the right type of vision, change-orientedness and administrative skills for the success of developmental programmes. This brings us to the question of how far the existing administrative structures of the post-colonial, post-independence societies of the Third World are competent and capable enough to carry on the tasks expected of them ? How well have they been playing their role and meeting the challenges ? This can be better understood if we analyse the problems and strains of the bureaucracy in the Third World in the context of the problems of interaction between the existing administrative structure and its colonial or past heritage in the functioning of administration and politics.

Ferrel Heady has discussed some of the common historical legacies of the developing countries as reflected in the characteristic features of their present administrative systems. These are as follows :[1]

(1) All countries, including those which escaped western colonization, have consciously tried to introduce some version of modern western bureaucratic administration. A country which was formerly a colony its administration will almost certainly resemble that of the coloniser.

1. Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration : A Comparative Perspective*, 1966, pp. 69-72.

(2) These bureaucracies are deficient in skilled manpower necessary for developmental programmes. The shortage being of trained administrators with management capacity, developmental skills and technical competence.

(3) These bureaucracies are other than production oriented. The value attached to status based on ascription rather than achievement explains much of this behaviour. Non-merit considerations may greatly influence promotions, assignment dismissals, and other personnel practices. Corruption is widespread.

(4) The widespread discrepancy between form and reality is what Riggs has called 'formalism'. It reflects an urge to make things seem as they presumably ought to be rather than what they really are. There is a wide gap between government proposals and their implementation, most laws being quietly bypassed or not implemented at all.

(5) Finally, the bureaucracy in a developing country is apt to have a generous measure of operational autonomy, which can be accounted for by the convergence of several forces usually at work in a recently independent and modernizing nation. Colonialism was essentially rule by bureaucracy with policy guidance from remote sources, and this pattern continued even after independence. Groups capable of competing for political influence or of imposing close controls over the bureaucracy are few, so that often it moves into a partial power vacuum. The political role of bureaucracy varies from country to country and is closely related to the particular political system type in a developing country.

During the colonial period the emphasis in transitional societies was on the establishment of legal and administrative structures of modern government. The task of building cohesive political processes was not the concern of colonial rulers. This led to an imbalance between administrative and political development in these countries. When they achieved independence their administrative systems were far more developed than the political with the result that the latter was ineffective and ill-equipped for determining the appropriate goals of administration, maintaining the integrity of the administrative system, and collaborating with it in achieving its welfare goals. Lucian Pye, F.W. Riggs and La Palombara also came to this conclusion in their analyses of bureaucratic and political developments in the new states. Pye, for instance, finds that these countries have neither effective administration nor stable polities and that public administration cannot be greatly improved without a parallel strengthening of the

democratic, representative political processes.[2]   Similarly, Riggs is struck by "the weakness of their extra-bureaucratic political institutions in contrast with the burgeoning growth of their bureaucracies and advances the thesis that premature or too rapid expansion of the bureaucracy when the political system lags behind tends to inhibit the development of effective politics".[3] Both Pye and Riggs thus emphasize the importance of strengthening the political system as a pre-condition for the effectiveness of administration; if the former is weak and ineffective, the latter will also partake of the same character. To both of them. excessive concentration on strengthening the administrative system without parallel strengthening of the political processes, will only accentuate the imbalance between administration and politics. By emphasizing the problem of the viability and relative importance of the political and administrative structures in political modernization, they provide a valuable insight for the planners and builders of new societies.

A conclusion which emerges from the above discussion is that the goal of realising a modern state and a modern society is greatly dependent upon the establishment of both a stable and cohesive polity and the strengthening of the authoritative structures of government. For example, in India, it would appear that there has been a decline in the functional capability of both the political and the administrative sectors of the system. A fundamental feature of political development in India is the ineffectiveness of the political system in dealing with increasing demands in the shape of providing basic services, maintaining law and order and formulating and executing policies.

The Indian administration still exhibits a continuity of the British bureaucratic system with its emphasis on formalism, impersonality, obsession for security and lack of bureaucratic initiative . . . . A major weakness of the Indian administrative system is its callousness in responding to the goals and demands of nation-building and modernization. A key problem in India is, therefore, the training, socializing and directing of a cadre of administrators who are sensitive and capable of adapting to the needs and responding to the issues of society. Another major problem of the administrative system relates to the need for its modernization which is related with the degree of specificity of functions, the extent of universalistic norms of conduct, and the existence of achievement standard. Such a transformation of the administrative system implies, among other things, its minimum

2. Lucian Pye, 'The Political Context of National Development' in Irving Swerdlow (ed.), *Development Administration : Concepts and Problems*, Syracuse University Press, 1963.

3. F. W. Riggs (ed.) *Frontiers of Development Administration*, Duke University Press, N.C., 1970.

professional and functional autonomy and its separation from political roles, and the adoption of modern administrative practices. The adoption of universalistic norms in administration, as in the sphere of political development, does not mean the supplanting of traditional norms and institutions but their utilization for the achievement of new goals.

The Indian Situation

The interaction between the administration and its past heritage in administrative and political fields can be further explained by citing other examples from the Indian situation. At the time of independence we had constitutionally adopted the goal of a democratic social welfare state. In this framework the public bureaucracy was to play a pivotal role as the chief agent of change and modernization.

The Government started on an ambitious model of planned development through democratic means relying on the traditional bureaucracy, which the nation had inherited from the British colonial period, to implement new schemes and programmes. Though the post-independence rulers viewed the old bureaucracy with suspicion, they retained the old structure of administration with piecemeal changes, wherever necessary. The Indian civil service of British days was a well-knit, homogeneous, all India service, generalist and non-technical in nature and comprising a small administrative elite, highly qualified, selected on merit, and trained in the traditional virtues of integrity, functional efficiency and neutrality in civil service. The colonial administration in India was authoritarian, paternalistic, preventive and coercive in nature and was fundamentally non-developmental. The main task of the administrators was the maintenance of law and order and collection of revenues. The bureaucrats being a specially privileged class in colonial society, gradually became by position and training conservative, rigid and the greatest supporters of British imperialism. They were given a large measure of operational autonomy without any institutionalised system of accountability to the people.

After independence the national scenario underwent tremendous change to incorporate the democratic socialistic ethos envisioned in the Constitution. Democracy brought in the Parliament, ministers, elections and political parties coupled with the concept of public accountability of civil servants. The nature of bureaucratic tasks also completely changed in variety, multiplicity and orientation. The emphasis shifted from preventive functions to service and development oriented.

In the context of the political, social and economic changes after independence the suitability of the inherited model of bureaucracy in the present time is often questioned. The change

from the pre-independence to the post-independence era is not only a change from 'limited government' to Big Government; but also from 'autocracy' to 'democracy'.

The bureaucracy has now to function in an environment where it works under the direction of a political head who is responsible for the department under his charge to the legislature. The political head has to act under many constraints like the policy guidelines from the legislature, and various pressures from political parties and other pressure groups.

Some of these important implications of democracy for the functioning of bureaucracy in our country have been discussed at length by C.P. Bhambri in his study of the Indian bureaucracy.[4]

Unlike the British period, the bureaucracy now is guided and controlled by the people's representatives. The political element lays down the public policies, defines the tasks of bureaucracy, and supervises their implementation. The meaning of supremacy of the political element in public policy formulation is that whatever may be the source of the origin of policy, its ultimate responsibility is on the political chief to defend and account for the policy in legislature. The challenge for the bureaucracy in India is to accept the supremacy of political leadership and to give it full co-operation. Indian bureaucrats who were given a large measure of functional autonomy during the British rule had developed a certain authoritarian style of functioning which they found difficult to give up after independence. Bureaucrats have repeatedly complained of political interference in administration in independent India. The elected representatives think they know what is best for the people, whereas bureaucrats who are working in the field feel that with their intimate knowledge of people and administration they have a right to interpret laws as they think fit. The politicians accuse the bureaucrats of being rigid and of blocking the implementation of progressive socialistic laws. The bureaucrats resent the latter's role in increasing politicisation of administration and their power in matters of civil service appointments, transfers, promotions etc., which has only led to increasing servility and compliance on the part of the civil servants to please their masters.

Another controversial feature of the politico-administrative relationship is the neutrality of civil service. One of the distinguishing features of the traditional concept of bureaucracy is its neutrality. In western societies the civil service retained its neutrality and anonymity in a liberal democracy with a competitive party system. A value-free neutral bureaucracy was possible in a society where consensus existed on values, but in transitional

---

4. C.P. Bhambhri, *Bureaucracy and Politics in India*, Delhi, Vikas, 1961, p. 61.

class-divided societies like ours where there is no consensus on values, it is neither desirable nor possible for the bureaucracy to function impartially, neutrally or in a value-free manner. There are all sorts of political parties, with wide ranging differences in opinion on political issues. It is scarcely surprising for civil servants to have political views and preferences of their own which may lead to unavoidable political bias, at times, in their attitudes.

Can impartial, passive and detached civil servants have the requisite emotional involvement with developmental programmes which is a necessary prerequisite of their success? Other qualities needed of a modern administrator are farsightedness, flexibility, dynamism and result orientedness. The old structure could perform well in a stagnant society. The civil service has to undergo radical, structural, procedural and attitudinal changes if it has to serve as an effective instrument of change and progress in a developing society. The civil service has to cultivate much wider social awareness and responsiveness to popular needs and aspirations. The administrative culture and ethos in our country has not kept pace with popular expectations after independence. The organisational structure and socio-economic background of the bureaucracy remains much the same as it was during the British days, except that the strength and functions of public administrators have increased greatly.

Another implication of a democratic political system is that the bureaucracy should shed its exclusiveness, reserve, and authoritarian style of functioning in general and come closer to the people. The people should on their part give up their anti-bureaucracy stance and show more inclination to participate at all levels of administrative and political activities, if they desire to get the fullest benefit of democratic government and administration. The relationship between the citizen and the administrator should be based on mutual goodwill and trust.

In a democratic administration the bureaucrats, who are accountable to the people are expected to have high standards of conduct, integrity and morality coupled with merit and efficiency. In India public enquiries revealed widespread corruption in the public services. Civil servants allege that corruption is an unfortunate by-product of political interference and increasing politicisation of the services. The issue of corruption has assumed gigantic proportions and is a great slur on our administrative system.

It is often said that this is a general reflection of the falling standards of integrity and conduct of our civil service as compared to the British period. However, this cannot be entirely true, says Bhambhri. The integrity and ethical standards of the British Indian Civil Service were not necessarily higher in every respect. Corruption was prevalent even in the British era, the instruments of public control over administration in our democratic

system have only helped to expose corruption much more than was possible during the British rule.

Conclusion : Like so many other developing countries, India is a state and society in transition from a semi-feudal, semi-capitalist, to an industrial and modernized society ; in Riggsian terms we are moving from the 'agraria' towards the 'industria'. The public administration too, like other social and political structures, is passing through a phase, when old norms and values of the bureaucracy are going through a process of renovation, readaptation and redefinition to suit new socio-economic changes and conditions of our time.

Interaction with Traditional Structures and Culture

Culture has been defined as the entire sum total of beliefs and social behaviour. Modes of social action and behaviour are human activity with respect to food, clothing, shelter, marriage, child rearing, entertainment, creative expression and so forth.

The culture of a country finds expression through the medium of language and art, philosophy and religion, education and science, films and newspapers, radio and television, social habits and customs, political institutions and economic organisations. Every society's culture is a storehouse of symbolic structures which function as institutionalized systems of meaning by which a human being assesses the historical situation and adapts himself to it.

An administrative system is concerned with the implementation of public policy and execution of laws. It renders various services to the people and in modern times is no longer a mere law and order enforcing agency but an indispensable arm of the government for attending to the welfare needs and aspirations of its citizens. Commenting on the relationship between culture and administration Waldo writes,[5] "Administration is a part of the cultural complex; and it not only is acted upon, it acts. Indeed, by definition, a system of rational cooperative action, it inaugurates and controls much change. Administration may be thought of as the major invention and device by which civilised men in complex societies try to control their culture."

Developing countries all over the Third World are facing common problems of poverty, overpopulation, ignorance, disease and underdevelopment. Most of them are ex-colonies and after independence have adopted nation-building and socio-economic progress, as their primary goals. With these objectives in mind they have adopted numerous welfare programmes and have entrusted the major responsibility for their implementation to public

---

5.   Dwight Waldo, *The Study of Public Administration*, Random House, New York, 1955, p. 11.

bureaucracies. Most of these countries have inherited an undemocratic administrative culture (authoritarian, unresponsive and elitists) which is a legacy of their colonial past. Modernization and development requires a dynamic, goal-oriented public administration which can initiate and implement progressive programmes. Another important prerequisite of social change is active public participation and cooperation in the development process. Unfortunately the public bureaucracies in these countries are most often neither structurally nor behaviourally equipped to carry out developmental tasks. They are further hampered by public inertia and resistance to change. This is mostly due to psychological hurdles like fear, poverty and ignorance of the people conditioned by national or regional customs and traditions.

For the purpose of the study culture will be conceived of in two ways. First, as a concept of power, potentially affecting social change and modernization in traditional societies, and secondly, that part of culture which bears relevance to management of politics. To some, culture represents the hallowed, the unchanging, and the unchangeable elements of the past divorced from the realm of administration. This is a shortsighted view. To a social thinker, culture is a dynamic variable and an enormously potent and influential instrument which the state or administration can use to adapt to its changing environment. Administration bears the unmistakable stamp of the cultural milieu of a particular period and yet, if given proper direction and leadership, can act as an instrument of social change. The various developmental policies and programmes of the government have a cultural dimension. Administration has an important role to play as it is the core of the system of various relationships that extend to the citizen, to the state and to the society at large.

The problem of forging culture and administration into instruments of social change is complex. The first requirement is a determination of the meaning, scope or relevance of these factors in the context of nation-building. At the same time, it would be necessary to identify the forces operating in the name of culture against social change and progress. The task of planners would be to evolve an appropriate technology of change and modernization relevant to the country's needs making full use of the existing local institutions, knowledge and traditions. In the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century, modernization in the Third World context had come to mean Europeanization of the upper classes and the adoption of western management and economic growth models to achieve socio-economic progress. Modernization in the contemporary world has come to acquire different meanings. Firstly, it does not necessarily mean the worldwide diffusion of a westernized culture, or wholesale adoption of western norms and cultural standards in societies. Each developing nation is seeking now to achieve economic progress and development not merely by

imitation of western models of culture and growth but by evolving
its own pattern of modernity. In other words, the sources of develop-
ment should not be entirely exogenous but endogenous as well.
There is an increasing tendency to evaluate the socio-cultural
functionality of imposed structural innovations in Third World
countries. In the evaluation of successful public administration, the
older concepts of efficiency and performance are not the sole
criteria now; the first concern is the satisfaction of citizens.
Development is not merely economic growth, but growth with
justice and social equity. To talk of endogenous development is
to seek development without cultural alienation, without destroying
or distorting the cultural personality of a people. It is to affirm
the principle that each society must remain itself drawing its
strength from the forms of thought and action that are peculiar to
it and gearing its development efforts to goals consistent with its
native value-system, needs and available resources. In short, the
work of development must be based on what the people of a
nation do, want, think, and believe. Their active and strongly
motivated participation is thus a precondition for ensuring the
originality of forms, styles and channels of development. The
administrator's role is to muster, organise and make rational use
of resources, once the political authorities have laid down the
main guidelines and objectives of development and to adapt and
incorporate plans and programmes to the socio-cultural environ-
ment.

That part of culture which bears relevance to politics or
management of polity is commonly known as political culture. In
any operative political system it is a force which gives meaning
as well as direction to the polity. This could be perceived in the
traditions of the society, the spirit of its public institutions, the
passions and collective behaviour of its citizenry and the style of
operation of its leaders.

The political element in a polity largely defines the goal
of administrative action based on the constitution and laws,
and it is the administration which has to carry out the
tasks towards achieving these goals. Administration keeps the
fabric of society intact. It is the art of management, the tool of the
state to achieve its goal. The art of administration is the direction,
coordination and control of many persons to achieve some collec-
tive purpose. The major differences in the political and cultural
patterns of modern and traditional societies have been analysed by
different scholars. Ferner describes the major difference between
traditional and modern political culture thus :

It deploys people by kinship into communities isolated from
each other and from a center; without an urban-rural division
of labour, it develops new needs requiring economic inter-
dependence; lacking the bonds of interdependence, people's

horizons are limited by locale and their decisions involve only other known people in known situations . . . . Modern society is participant in that it functions by consensus—individuals making personal decisions on public issues must concur with other individuals they do not know, to make possible a stable common governance.[6]

J.S. Coleman in an impressive summary of a wide variety of developing political cultures also identifies participation as an essential aspect of modern society. He calls attention to the "wide gap which exists between the traditional mass and the essentially modern sub-society of the westernized elite." They are, in fact, the main focus of political activity. He indicates that governing elites (includes the administrators) in many emerging nations are "engaged in the development and strengthening of system wide secondary structures that not only impinge directly upon the individual but also penetrate the primary socializing structures. They are seeking to create by an act of will, an integrated process of political socialization in which at all levels there is an inculcation of positive sentiments of respect, loyalty and pride in the new politics . . . . Their efforts are being met with strong resistance, especially from particularistic forces—forces which modernization itself ironically tends, in many situations, to strengthen."[7]

Traditional structures and culture are often ignored in the various efforts made to reform administration in developing countries. The characteristics of western bureaucracy are generally considered the ideal typical type to be imitated in Third World countries.

Besides, development is the responsibility of the state alone and the people are considered an ignorant and passive mass to be directed by administration. The local culture and traditional structures are all sought to be replaced by western structures and values imposed by the state administration. However, western style bureaucracies often tend to become irrelevant in the vastly different environments of developing societies. A coldly formal and neutral bureaucracy concerned with proper procedures and file work will find it impossible to deal with people who are illiterate, superstitious, and ignorant of the forms and methods of the functioning of secular institutions. What is required in these countries is oral communication and effective dialogue coupled with informal relationship, to get public co-operation and support, to break the vicious circle of fear and ignorance against change and innovation.

6. Daniel Ferner, *The Passing of the Transitional Society*, Glencoe, The Free Press, 1958, p. 50.
7. Paul Meadows, "Motivation for Change and Development Administration" in Irving Swerdlow (ed.), *Development Administration : Concepts and Problems*, Syracuse University Press, New York, 1963, pp. 98-99.

The public administrator should make use of the existing traditional forms of cooperation to encourage greater participation by the people. The real goal should be to make the administration endogenous in terms of attitudes and behaviour, that is, its acculturation. With the responsibility that has devolved upon it to execute socio-economic programmes, there is need for making the administration culturally sensitive.

Culturally sanctioned values and symbols have acted as important catalysts of change in human history. History is witness to the fact that whenever the economic task has become a cultural challenge, economic development has received a fillip. For example, the Puritans in England, the Samurai in Japan and the Bolsheviks in Russia. They came, not as economic or industrial pioneers but as the torchbearers of "new all round transformation of the nation's destiny."[8] Similar was the message that Gandhi gave to our nation. He used our culture as an instrument of modernization and social change.

Indian culture is a composite one, of unity and synthesis, of reconciliation and growth, of harmony and assimilation, a fusion of old traditions and new values. While viewing culture as power, we have to take note of the fact that the forces of progress and regress have simultaneously worked in our culture. Historically our culture has sustained a highly individualistic ethos and a stratified society. It was considered natural and proper for man to be born unequal and enjoy unequal rights and privileges. These inequalities were given some sort of legitimacy by means of a system based on the theories of dharma and karma. Men were born as Brahmins, or Shudras according to the law of karma and in society it was their dharma to act in accordance with the situation of life to which they were born. The law of Manu more or less formalised these inequalities. The forces of rationalism and change invigorated our society with the rise of Buddhism and Jainism, but these failed for a variety of reasons. In certain periods of history, there developed institutions of caste and untouchability. The caste system broke up the unity of Indian life and impeded the growth of an open society. It continues to be a powerful force still.

Viewed against this backdrop a trend which is clearly discernible in the Indian situation is the hiatus between the political culture of various elite groups and mass political culture. After independence, India became one of the few nations in which power was deliberately and successfully decentralised. The result has been that at the local levels less educated and more traditional individuals have acquired political power who have brought with them their

8. For a detailed analysis see B.P. Singh, "Political Culture and Public Administration in the National Value System : The Indian Scenario," *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXVII, No. 4, 1981, pp. 1043-1054.

attitudes towards power and government, which the educated urban elite, mostly at the national level, find less acceptable. There, thus, have emerged two political cultures in our country operating at different levels of the Indian polity. The elite political culture is personified by India's planners, national political leaders and members of senior administrative services. The mass culture is rural oriented and is more rooted in tradition.

A look at the administrative history of India reveals that barring certain periods, there was no unity in administration. India's political disunity has been largely conditioned by the inadequacy of her scientific and technological strength vis-a-vis her geographical and cultural unity. While geography and culture demanded unification of the country, the prevalent state of control over the forces of nature rendered this difficult to achieve and almost impossible to maintain. The vastness of the country and the absence of modern methods of communication worked against political unification.

In India, the modernization process has created problems of its own. The traditions of family and village have undergone change, leading to the breakup of joint family system. Within the same village and in the same town, different consumption patterns and purchasing capacities have come up. Unemployment, regional disparities, the growth of rural urban hiatus have created social divisions and inequality. This has led to some dissent from modernization. However, the need is to accelerate the modernization process to alleviate people's poverty which can be achieved only through science and technology and spread of education. In other words, people are to be motivated to break "the culture of poverty" and adopt a rational scientific cultural ethic which would hasten progress and development. In this the administration has a vital role to play.

The most crucial impact of social change has been in the growth of administrative functions in India. Increasingly, a new administrative ethos is being seen in India which reflects the popular will and is motivating to develop organisational competence and inputs to tackle the new challenges. In this context, administration is continually interacting with the political, economic and socio-cultural value system of our society. It is both a modifying influence upon these systems and is itself getting modified by them in turn. Unfortunately, the declining moral standards in public life have adversely affected quality of administration at every level. It is in this context that the new public administration has to devise built-in safeguards against forces leading to maladjustment and confusion, corruption and lethargy.

Eradication of poverty as well as an overall progress can only be achieved through science and technology and by a clear understanding of how natural forces work and how these could be

harnessed for human betterment. Science has created the capacity
to liberate large masses of humanity from misery, poverty, squalor
and disease. The increasing use of science and technology in the
affairs of our economy and society at large is dependent upon the
type of values which we cherish and propagate. Administration
could provide the patent catalytic force to the forces of change by
forging culture and administration into instruments of social
change.

Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion certain aspects clearly stand out :
first, there are forces operating in the name of culture against
change and progress. Second, a pre-requisite for rapid socio-
economic progress is the expeditious propagation of a scientific
temper and respect for rationality. Besides, a third important aspect
is to initiate certain institutional changes like electoral reforms
and decentralisation to usher, in a new political culture which
will be able to hold the people together and will move them, and
the administration, to work for improving the present state of the
nation, ensuring total commitment for secular institutions in all
matters relating to our social, cultural, political and economic life.
Our political leaders and administrators should understand the
logic of development processes and fulfil the rising expectations of
the people by moulding and recreating cultural symbols, where
necessary, to hasten the development process.

Where tradition does not conflict with development administra-
tion, initial public resistance to change can generally be overcome
by visible signs of success. There is seldom continued resistance,
on principle, to innovation, be it administrative or technological.
Once an innovation or administrative programme is shown to be
useful, religious teachings often encourage cooperation. Hindu
scriptures, for example, speak of nishkama-karma (action without
the desire for its fruits), a code taken by Gandhi and most other
Hindu leaders to inculcate a new work ethics. Secondly, in the
four stages of life in the Hindu religion, artha can be interpreted
as keen participation in social activities to improve material and
ideal living standard among fellowmen. In India, the persuasive
power of the religious or charismatic leaders, considered the tradi-
tional authority figures, can also be utilized in mobilizing popular
support.

Knowledge of the culture of a region can be of positive benefit
to the development administrator. A familiarity with tradition
can help him to refine his method of introducing an innovation and
getting support for it. Traditional patterns of thought and action
can often be turned from impediments into assets. Generally, the
methods rather than the targets of administration determine
whether cultural processes will retard or facilitate development

efforts. The targets are so broad and general that they can be made acceptable no matter what the cultural milieu. But an agency or administrator's methods may either clash or fall in line with traditional norms and values.

The administrator must strive to distinguish cultural hurdles, conditioned by peculiarities in regional traditions from what has been called universal psychological hurdles, e.g., fear, general poverty, insecurity and ignorance. Changes which are truly incompatible with tradition must be distinguished from those that are merely thought to be so. Problems arising from cultural as distinguished from universal hurdles can often be overcome by reference to tradition. "Only by such cultural improvisations can the administrator's method be designed to minimize friction between modernization and tradition."[9]

Impact of Political System

The main function of a political system is the formulation and implementation of public policy through the mobilization of national resources and their allocation for the attainment of societal goals. The capability of a political system refers to the capacity of both the policy and government to meet increasingly heavy demands and challenges, the loads they are able to bear, and their outputs in terms of policies, decisions and their implementation.

With the expansion of the functions of government and its increasing role in social and economic development, the administrative system has assumed much importance. The administrator plays a dual role primarily performing the "output" function of executing policies and programmes; he also performs important "input" functions which relate not only to policy making but also to determining public orientation towards the government, the expectations that the public has from the government and the demands that are channelled into the political process. The administrative system thus performs a significant role, in the capability function of the political system, both in the "input" and "output" aspects, and links the polity to society.

In the words of Peter Self :

The political process deals with the input of demands and the administrative process with the output of services. The former process moves upwards, embracing the claims of successively broader constituencies, while the latter process moves downwards, disaggregating laws and general policies into specific operations. Both processes can be said to have become more

9. Aghenanda Bharati, "Cultural Hurdles in Development Administration" in Irving Swerdlow (ed.), *Development Administration : Concepts and Problems*, 1963, pp. 68-82.

'pluralistic', in the sense that influences and decisions have become more diffused and that (in most western democracies) more contacts occur between the two processes.[10]

The influence and impact of the political system on the administrative system is great due to the close relation between politics and administration in all societies. There is a continuing academic debate in the discipline of public administration regarding the relationship between the two. The history of public administration began with an essay written on the issue by Woodrow Wilson in 1887 when he made a clear distinction betweeen "politics" (where government makes choices over public policy) and "administration" (which serves the people by implementing and executing government decisions and laws without participating in active politics.)

There were and still are a group of scholars in public administration, who would "take administration" out of politics and would want the public servants to remain politically neutral and out of partisan politics. But the fact is that the activities of policy making and policy execution are not entirely separate. All government and administrative work is to a certain extent political. Much legislation originates in the executive departments and the administrators play an important role in policy formulation by their expert advice, suggestion and supply the required information to the ministers concerned. According to Paul Appleby all administration and policy making within the government are political, but only a small part of either has identifiable partisan character. He has elaborated the relationship between politics and administration thus: society has certain needs and demands and government is the only institution in society to meet these demands and needs. Government today has both preventive functions, like maintenance of law and order and collection of revenue, as well as welfare oriented functions, like providing for education, transport and sanitation. Politics is the means by which society faces up to the issues and decides how to resolve them. Politics involves a choice among alternative values, philosophies, and goals.

Societal needs and pressures when accepted may eventually become law. Law takes many forms, including enacted constitutions, statutory enactment, and administrative and judicial decisions. Administration is the application of policy formulated by law in a constantly unfolding process, making the laws of legislatures and the courts increasingly specific by means of policy application to particular cases.[11]

10. Peter Self, *Administrative Theories and Politics*, S. Chand and Co. Ltd., New Delhi, 1984, p. 5.

11. M.E. Dimock, *Public Administration*, pp. 101-103.

Irrespective of the nature of political system, at the higher levels politics and administration are inseparable from each other. Herbert Simon designated the entire process, as one of 'decision-making,' regardless of its policy or administrative nature. Political thinkers like Peter Self have accepted the concept of administrative politics, thereby meaning that administration is a branch of politics.

The executive in most countries comprised two major elements—the political and the permanent, with interlocking functions at the higher levels. In the socialist countries, administration is highly politicised, and suffused with political content and control at every level. The hierarchies of the political and administrative systems interlock at every level. In the discussion on the Russian and Chinese administrative systems this point has been clearly elaborated.

In democratic systems, the legislature through law lays down the government policy, that is, it clearly states the framework within which the administration has to execute or implement laws in particular circumstances. In cabinet systems, as in Britain and India, political control is further exercised by making members of the council of ministers (who are members of the majority party in Parliament) the heads of administrative departments. In the American system, the fact that the chief executive as well as the legislatures are popularly elected, implies a common source of authority, power and purpose.

Legislatures make laws, but administrators determine what the law is, in terms of execution. Administrators offer considerable suggestions and guidelines to framers of policy, who only lay down a very broad framework of policy which is made functionally more specific by the administrators. Moreover, the scope of government functions today is so vast that legislatures, out of sheer necessity, delegate more and more responsibility for the content of policy proposals to administrative agencies. This was the main reason for the origin of the concept of delegated legislation.

Situation in Developing Countries

A significant feature of the political systems of developing countries is the increasingly central role that their governments and bureaucracy have come to play in the programme of development. The very concept of government is undergoing a fundamental change in these countries. Not only has its role changed from governance by coercion, to that of administration of public welfare but its activities are also assuming a new range, and depth. Whether democratic or authoritarian, the governments of developing countries are playing a key role in stimulating, programming and implementing development activity. Therefore, the growth of the state capacity

to give a purposeful direction to socio-economic change is a crucial dimension of the capability function of the political systems of the developing states.

It is clear that the capacity of developing countries to deal effectively with the problems of nation-building and modernization depends upon the development of coherent and viable political systems and effectiveness of bureaucratic role. To fulfil these tasks the political system must evolve a participant "civic culture", ensure sustained economic growth and promote national unity and consensus. Such a transformation or development makes it necessary to secure the acceptance of, and commitment to, the new purposes, goals and techniques by, at least, the major sectors of society. This underlines the importance of social mobilization for building a sustained support to the efforts at nation building and socio-economic and technological development.

While the administrative structure is essential for formulating and carrying out operating programmes, they suffer from many deficiencies in their framework in the developing countries. Often the administrative agencies align with political leaders leading in factional politics and rivalry between the departments. They also show a tendency towards acquiring independent power positions to increase their group interests. Their energies are more often spent in perpetutating their self interest than in the pursuit of development goals. Bureaucracy in developing countries is often short on enterprise, initiative and adaptability, slow to act, and arrogant and callous in dealing with the public.

Political leaders and the administrators, as stated earlier, perform the important functions of maintaining societal stability, and goal-attainment. Performing different but complementary roles and manning structures which involve the development processes of society, they constitute two fundamental instruments of social and political change. The relation and interaction between these two sectors, politics and administration, therefore, have an important bearing on development processes and tasks. Their relationship and interactions operate both at the macro level affecting the stability and dynamism of the regimes and at the micro level influencing the implementation of individual programmes.

Administration influences, and is influenced by the polity. Some of the elements in this interaction in India need to be briefly noted here. Firstly, the administration is getting increasingly politicised. The political leaders and elected representatives of the people tend to control the administration excessively, interfere with its implementation process and bring unjust pressures and demands on it. This has both healthy and adverse effects on the administration, it restrains administrative excesses and corruption and makes the administrators responsible to the elected representatives

of the people and responsive to their problems. But excessive political control on and interference with the administration makes the latter frustrated and powerless thereby reduces its independence and effectiveness. This also frequently leads to the involvement of administrators in partisan politics such as elections. Secondly, the administration shows a tendency towards grabbing power at levels where the political leadership is weak. In such cases, the administration becomes a power centre and resists the growth of democratic supervision over its activities.

In other words, both the political leaders and administrators seek to exchange their power. This gives rise to tensions and conflicts in their interaction and does not permit them to collaborate in nation-building and development activities. Given the differences in culture and professional background of the politicians and administrators, conflicts and tensions between them are likely to continue.

Finally, and as emphasized earlier, the performance capacity of the administrative system depends to a great extent on the development of cohesive and stable political institutions and processes, the emergence of dynamic and change-oriented political leadership, and a cooperative relationship between politicians and administrators. No administrative development can take place unless there is effective "organization and institutionalization" of political organizations and procedures such as the party system, legislatures, cabinets and democratic norms and procedures. Administration is also conditioned by the quality and capility of the political leadership. Both the politicians and administrators have to work together for fulfilling the common goals of nation-building and development.

Relationship of Ministers and Civil Servants

The relation between ministers and higher civil servants in a modern parliamentary government is essentially based on the concept of civil service neutrality. The theory of the neutrality of the civil service was developed in England to meet the requirements of the parliamentary system of government in which the tenure of the political executive is unstable due to periodic elections, and resultant change of government.

In the cabinet system, as it evolved in Great Britain, a clear demarcation was made between the political executive (the ministers) and the permanent administrators. The political executive normally performed the following functions :

    (i)   Represented the government policy within the administration;

    (ii) Brought the viewpoint of the general public to bear on the administrative decisions;

(iii)   Provided leadership in developing national policy;

(iv)   Exercised statutory powers vested in them.

On the other hand, the functions of the career administrators are the following :

(i)   execution of laws and government decisions;

(ii)   providing expert guidance, information and managerial assistance to the political executive, where necessary;

(iii) maintaining the continuity of administration;

(iv)   helping the political executive to understand the probable consequences of alternative courses of action.

The points of difference between the political and administrative officers do not end here. A minister is an amateur in administration, his office is of a temporary nature and he is more in touch with the public. He plays a key role in formulating policy, and has a partisan outlook. On the other hand, a career official is a professional in administrative affairs and enjoys a permanent tenure. His contacts with the public are much less, and his main task is to execute policy without dabbling in active politics. He is expected to be non-partisan and politically neutral.

In all systems, according to Peter Self, there are certain typical forms of interaction between the politicians and administrators which result from the distinctive style and interests of the two groups of participants. Important areas of interaction include policy-making, arbitration of interests, treatment of individual and local claims, and balancing between political accountability and administrative discretion. In the first two areas, politicians have formal responsibility, but administrators supply the missing elements of political decisions. In the third area, administrators defend their distinctive methods or uniformity and impartiality against politicians' frequent interest in influencing particular decisions. The fourth area represents an inevitable point of conflict between the needs and interests of the two groups.[12]

Political neutrality is an essential complement to the merit system (in recruitment and promotion of personnel) for it guarantees that the civil servants who have been recruited and promoted by merit will give the minister—whatever be his political complexion—impartial advice and criticism whenever he needs it. Further, it assures the ministers that irrespective of the personal

likes or dislikes of his subordinate officials, the ultimate decisions of the minister will be faithfully implemented by the civil servants. Political neutrality means not only the absence of political activity or bias on the part of civil servants but also that they will serve every government that comes to power irrespective of its party affiliations.

The main reason for the advocacy of civil service neutrality is that the civil servant can serve the changing governments drawn from different parties with the same vigour and honesty. Since execution, not formulation is the task of the civil servant, any commitment other than to the goals and objectives of his allotted tasks will defeat the very purpose for which he exists. Besides exercising his voting rights, if he engages in partisan politics his role as an impartial adviser and administrator would be seriously impaired in the eyes of the public.

If the administration is to work efficiently and smoothly, and the governmental objectives are to be achieved satisfactorily, the minister and his subordinate officials must work in cooperation and harmony. There should be mutual faith and trust. Ministers should not interfere too much in day-to-day administration. Commenting on the minister-civil servant relationship the Administrative Reforms Commission laid down the following norms :

(a) the obligation of every public servant to implement faithfully all policies and decisions of the ministers even if these be contrary to the advice tendered by him;

(b) the freedom of public servants to express themselves frankly in tendering advice to their superiors including the minister; and

(c) the observance by public servants of the principles of political neutrality, impartiality and anonymity. It expressed the view that due to differing backgrounds and interests of ministers and their secretaries the desired emotional unison and unity of purpose is still to be realised.

It is the minister who remains constitutionally responsible for his department to the parliament. If something goes wrong in his department he alone has to give a satisfactory account of it to the parliament. This implies that even in cases where he is not personally responsible, he has to take responsibility for any act of ommission and commission of his official subordinates.

However, the traditional concept of civil service neutrality is undergoing a change, particularly in the developing countries, under the impact of many factors. The doctrine of civil service neutrality represents a particular stage in the development of the

party system of government. An important factor bearing on this question is the pivotal role the civil servants are being called upon to play in the developing countries. The successful implementation of developmental tasks requires on the part of administrators, not only qualities of initiative and leadership but emotional and intellectual commitment to the social welfare values adhered to by the state as well.

The relevance of the classical theory of neutrality has often come to be questioned for the following reasons. (a) The processes of policy decision-making are no longer confined to the political executive; they percolate through the entire fabric of government resulting in inescapable items of delegation and zones of such policy where the political executive does not come into the picture at all, and yet, the decisions reflect the ethos of the party in power. (b) The leadership role of public bureaucracy is explicit in all political systems, but is more pronounced in the setting of developing countries. In the context of large-scale welfare programmes, neutrality is neither possible nor desirable. A certain commitment to the goals and objectives of the state is inescapable—neutrality cannot be allowed to degenerate into disinterestedness. (c) In the sphere of policy advice and execution, modern bureaucracy takes an active part. (d) At the top levels, even the performance appraisal of public bureaucracy is done by political heads and an element of political assessment is bound to creep into such an assessment. (e) As a human being, no civil servant can be psychologically neutral on issues and problems which confront him; he is a product of his upbringing and a certain subjective element from his judgments cannot be eradicated.[13]

Thus, the basic assumptions behind the concept of bureaucratic neutrality are that it is the product of a merit system and therefore seeks to reflect it in those systems where this concept is recognised in the behaviour of the bureaucrat, and that the advantages of permanency, continuity, reliability and professionalism which are supposed to obtain in a neutral bureaucracy far outweigh the disadvantages, conservatism, reluctance to depart from routine and resistance to change. These assumptions are refuted in modern times in practically all political systems—including western democracies where such ideals originated.

Therefore, the only acceptable connotation for this doctrine seems to be an idea of non-partisanship and impartiality in the sense that where the civil servants are implementing a body of statutory laws and regulations, they shall act impartially and not carry into these operations any political considerations which are not contemplated in the statutory law. However, for the large

13.   O.P. Dwivedi and R.B. Jain, *India's Administrative State*, Gitanjali Publishing House, New Delhi, 1985, pp. 72-73.

bulk of their activity, that is, non-statutory, a new doctrine is necessary to suit the modern times. In the absence of a better phraseology what should shape the attitudes of the civil servants now is a doctrine of political responsiveness which may have the broad name of commitment.[14]

Interaction Between Administrative and Economic Systems

The economic system is one of the subsystems of society concerned with the production of goods and services and to meet the material needs and wants of the citizens. The economic system includes the entire productive process—factors and instruments of production, land, labour, capital and entrepreneurs, as well as the clients and consumers of goods, and services. The economic system is vitally connected with the administrative system in more than one ways. Administration executes and implements policy, and the economic factor is one of the prime determinants of public policy.[15]

Marxist social thinkers view the entire political process as an outcome of the economic process; the economic system is the subsystem on which the entire superstructure of politics and administration is built. Liberal social scientists though admitting substantial link between the economic and other subsystems of society, emphasize the autonomy of the political and economic structures in society especially in industrial societies.

Economic systems can be of various patterns—feudal, capitalist, socialist and mixed economy type depending on the nature and level of socio-economic development and economic infrastructure existing in these societies. Different economic systems may co-exist with different types of government—monarchical, democratic and autocratic. But the only common element in any kind of economic or political system is the existence of a public administrative structure which is indispensable to the proper functioning of both the economic and political systems. Economic activities are not exclusively carried out by economic structures of society, other structures—social, political or administrative—also perform economic functions. In the policy of *laissez faire* the intervention of the state in economic matters is minimum; administrative functions are mainly regulatory and negative in nature. With the advent of modern welfare states the economic intervention of the state has increased tremendously—specially in developing countries where the state not only provides basic utilities and a wide range of services, but undertakes the major

14. M.K. Chaturvedi, "Commitment in Civil Service", *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 17 (1971), pp. 41-42.
15. Ryan C. Amacher, R.D. Tellison and T.D. Wellett (eds.), *The Economic Approach to Public Policy*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1976.

responsibility of economic welfare and development. The entire administrative machinery of the state is geared to the tasks of nation-building and socio-economic progress. The administration in developing countries is over-burdened with what may be called economic aspects of administration, that is, tasks related to administration of developmental programmes. Administration is expected to be the key instrument of socio-economic change and well-being of the citizens. The major component of development or modernization is economic progress and the entire success of administration depends on how well it is able to perform these tasks. Administrative failure to deliver the goods may bring discontent, alienation and turbulence which may have catastrophic consequences for the stability of any state. However, in sharply class-divided societies, administrators generally belong to the privileged classes. Their vested interests may often block the implementation of progressive laws.

In industrial as well as developing societies, how socio-economic conditions affect the policy making process has been discussed elsewhere in the book. Every policy is decided after a rational assessment of its economic costs and likely impact and political outcome.[16] The political outcome is often influenced by the economic impact of different policies, some explicitly economic in nature and some not so. Economy is one factor which helps to regulate what is possible or desirable among alternative policies. Policy makers and administrators in developing countries face a different economic setting, that is, different demands for programmes as well as different resources to pay for them, than do policy makers in developed countries. It is not only the differences in economic environment that distinguish these various policy makers and the policies they produce but their economic enviroments often explain many of the differences among them.

When writers on political economy decscribe the various economic forces that shape public policy, they often refer to the level of economic development. This is a wide concept that summarises a set of economic components plus certain social variables that reflect economic conditions. Developing states not only suffer from shortage of capital but also from other handicaps that both reveal and reinforce this shortage. The entire concept of economic development would include (a) the quantity and quality of natural resources, such as, land, fuel and other mineral resources; (b) the human physical and financial resources, weighed in terms of skills of the population, industrial, transportation and power generating facilities, and financial assets; (c) the level of agricultural and industrial development; (d) the

16. Aaron Wildavsky, "The Political Economy of Efficiency : Cost Benefit Analysis, Systems Analyses and Program Budgeting", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXVI No. 4, 1966, pp. 292-310.

capacity of such financial institutions as the tax system and banks to generate the funds needed for investment: (e) the character of foreign trade; a developed economy exports mainly processed and manufactured goods whereas an underdeveloped economy exports mainly raw materials; (f) the nature of the distribution of economic rewards. Highly developed economies have a relatively even distribution of incomes and opportunities among the various regional and social divisions of the population.

The various components of economic development are the concerns of policy makers and the administrators. They are an important part of the environment of policy making and implementation, influencing the demands and resources received by the policy makers and administrators. They are also the targets of the policymakers as they seek to improve the economy by the short or the long term measures.

The degree of economic development in a state affects public policy by shaping the quality and quantity of the resources available to officials. The more developed an economy, the more easily its governments should be able to collect the revenues to pay for the activities it undertakes. Studies of different nations reveal that governments of richer nations spend more on education, health benefits, housing, pensions and welfare benefits to the poor. Yet even in the wealthiest states limited funds continually restrict the selection of policy.

Well developed economies also make available more of the highly trained professional and technical personnel needed to staff administrative agencies. This supply of trained personnel results partly from earlier investments in schools and universities, as well as from cultural factors that make the pursuit of education and an administrative career attractive for the talented job seekers. A problem faced by developing countries is a lack of skilled native personnel needed to staff their administrations. The level of economic development also shades the demands made on the administration. Citizens with better education, higher occupational skills tend to demand facilities for higher education, investments in research and development, and creation of more recreational facilities in the state. However, the primary concerns of the citizens of developing societies are jobs, housing and public health facilities.

The urbanization and industrialization in a well developed economy also generate demands on administrations, for example, programmes of sewage disposal, housing and drinking water facilities, slum clearance.

The influence and impact of the economic system of the administrative system, though universal, varies in different societies. In industrial societies the bureaucracies are more efficient and

have less of welfare functions than in economically backward societies where the administration has multifarious functions to perform in the economic sphere. The steady increase in the size and functions of bureaucracies is, however, a universal phenomenon.

An Integrated Perspective

Public administration is concerned with the activities of all the three branches of government, but the widely accepted view is that public administration is connected with the activities of the executive branch only. In the words of Marx :

At its fullest range, public administration embraces every area and activity under the jurisdiction of public policy. . . . By established usage, however, the term 'Public Administration' has come to signify primarily the organisation, personnel, practices and procedures, essential to effective performance of the civilian functions entrusted to the executive branch of government.[17]

Also, it has much to do with the activities of the executive branch of the government at all levels—national, state and local.

Pfiffner writes that public administration is concerned with 'the what', and 'the how' of government.[18] The 'what' is the subject matter, technical knowledge of a field which enables an administrator to perform his tasks. The 'how' is the technique of management. The major divisions of the subject matter fall naturally into four groupings :

1. What a government does—determination of objectives, internal administrative policies and plans and the range of governmental business.

2. How a government organizes its staff, and finances its work, that is, the structure of government organization.

3. How administrators secure cooperation and team-work—study of such problems as administrative responsibility, leadership, direction, coordination, delegation, headquarters-field relationships, supervision and public relations.

4. How administration is held accountable ? This means study of internal controls, and control of administrative activities by the legislature and the courts.

By common consensus, the essential components of administration are : (1) planning, (2) organising, (3) staffing, (4) initiating, (5) delegating, (6) directing, (7) overseeing, (8) co-ordinating, and (9) evaluating. The various activities forming part of the scope of

17.   F.M. Marx, *Elements of Public Administration*, p. 5.
18.   Pfiffner and Presthus, *Public Administration*, p. 3.

public administration are indicated by POSDCORB, a word coined by Luther Gulick.

Generally, public administrative activities fall into the following main categories : (1) protective and regulatory activities, e.g., maintaining police, fire, health protection agencies, national defence, education, conservation of natural resources (protective); regulation of particular business or activities through such agencies as the Tariff Commission, the Coffee Board, the Finance Commission etc. (regulatory); (2) promotional activities and or assistance to particular economic and social groups, e.g., farmers, factory workers, businessmen, women and children in industry, the aged, the unemployed ; (3) entrepreneurial activities, where a government owns and operates enterprises serving the public, e.g., post offices, irrigation canals, public corporations or a municipal water or electric-power department.

Public administration in any developed government is a complex affair. It can be examined in terms of the people of which it is composed—departments, agencies, branches and units; of its legal procedures—constitution, statutes, executive orders ; of its procedures—filing systems, correspondence, conferences, memoranda, reports; and of its techniques—management improvement, personnel classification, accounting controls. All these go to make up public administration; but these do not comprise all the activities of public administration. Administrators are also deeply concerned with legislative and public relations, with programme objective and pressure groups, with public support and social ends.

Finally, administration is concerned with organizational relationships and the problem of integration, which may be related to : the citizen, the structure of government, society and the economy, the human factor in administration, techniques and values, stages of national development, levels of operation, and to the ingredients that constitute the synthesis of public administration itself.

The systems framework provides a clue to the need for an integrated perspective on public administration. Ira Sharkansky[19] has elaborated the systems framework in her approach to public administration. Her analysis runs thus:

> An administrative system is the combination of the administrative unit and all of the elements and processes that interact with the unit, that is, (1) the environment within which the administrative unit operates and which influences and is influenced by the unit, and (2) the inputs to the (3) outputs from the unit that are connected with each other by the (4) conversion process, and by (5) feedback mechanisms.

19. Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1978, p. 7.

The environment includes the numerous social, economic and political conditions that present problems to the administrators and that subsequently assist or confound their efforts to resolve these problems. The environment comprises the clients who are to benefit from a policy; a market that is influenced by the adoption of a policy; interest groups, members of the public, and other units of government that express political support for or opposition to a policy. While some of these elements facilitate policy-making and the solution of social problems, others make the problems difficult for the administrators. Policy inputs are the resources sent from the environment to the conversion process of the administrative system. These include demands for policy, human and natural resources, support or opposition towards the actions of administrators. People demand public goods and services for their own use, for example, recreation facilities, education, transportation, and health services. They also demand the regulation of other people's behaviour, for example, by the policy commissions that limit the actions of business and labour, and the military. A 'demand' may take the form of a routine request for service, such as filing an application with a welfare office or a state university; it may simply be a statement that an agency should introduce a new service; or it could be a public confrontation with law enforcing agencies. Resources include personnel, skills, materials, technology, and money. Support, opposition, or apathy shows itself in the degree of willingness of a population to pay taxes, to accept government employment, and to accept the government's regulation of behaviour. It is also evident by their patience in the face of adversity and by their sentiments towards administrative personnel.

It is not only the inputs that influence the actions of administrators, features of the conversion process itself affect their actions. Because they originate within the conversion process, they are called 'with inputs', which include chains of command and other formal structures found within administrative agencies, the procedures used by officials to make their decisions, the administrators' personal experiences and predispositions; and the ways the administrative superiors control their subordinates. Besides, there may be conflicts between the formal rules of the organization and the personal values of administrators; clashes among administrators that increase the problems in making agency outputs; and decision-makers' use of routine procedures to simplify complex and numerous inputs.

'Outputs' that administrators provide to their environment include services, tangible goods, and behavioural regulations, statements, and activities. Administrators also provide direct benefits—information, technical advice, and concrete proposals necessary for policy formulation to officials in other government units. Legislators and politicians make their living by promising

and delivering services to voters. Most of these services are implemented by administrative agencies. The administrators' failure to provide desired services may offend both the citizens and the elected members of the legislative branch. Such failures are 'negative outputs'.

'Policy', then, represents efforts of administrators and other officials to make choices in public affairs. Performance represents the work that is actually delivered. Policies can aim at services by defining expenditures, salary levels, number of employees and the rules that govern treatment of clients. Performance may reflect the influence of policies, but it also reflects the influence of various factors that complicate the implementation of policy. It is often difficult to judge administrators' performance, partly because a policy may have several goals spelled out in the legislation or the statements of administrators. For each policy, there may be different ways of measuring performance, by the frequency with which services are actually made available; by the evaluation of services by clients or professional experts; or by changes in the levels of consumer satisfaction as a result of a programme.

'Feedback' represents the influence of earlier outputs upon the demands, resources, support, or opposition (inputs) that an administrative system receives. Existing tax legislation influences the flow of economic resources into administrative agencies. Public services and regulatory policies affect citizens directly and thus shape the demands they make. Past efforts to promote economic development may affect social and economic conditions in ways that influence both the resources provided by existing taxes and the demands and supports coming from the population. Feedback mechanisms are evident in the continuity of interactions among administrators and the many sources of their inputs and the recipients of their outputs. Citizens and legislators are seldom satisfied once and for all times. Some always demand more. They may demand improvement of existing services, expansion of the magnitude of services to provide for increased population, and expansion of the scope of a programme to provide for certain needs left unmet by present activities. Client groups and legislators are always making some effort to get administrators to change their policies or their decisions in particular cases. The diagram of the administrative system illustrates these points.

Environment includes (1) clients, (2) costs of goods and services, and (3) members of the public and other government officials who support or oppose agencies, administrators, or programmes.

The administrator plays a two-fold role. Firstly, he assists the process of policy-making; and secondly, once the policy has been determined, he has the responsibility for its implementation. Primarily performing the "output" function of executing policies

The Administrative System[20]

Inputs from environment include	Conversion Process	Outputs to environment include
1. demands, 2. resources, and 3. support or opposition from citizens and officials of other branches of government	With-inputs include (1) structures, (2) decision, procedure (3) administrator's personal experiences and predispositions, and (4) control procedures	Expressions of policy plus performance, or goods and services actually delivered to the public and to officials in other segments of government

Feedback

It represents influence that outputs have upon the environment in a way that shapes subsequent inputs.

and programmes, the administrator also performs important "input" functions. His "input" functions relate not only to policy making but also to determining public orientation towards the government, the expectations that the public has from the government and the demands that are channelled into the political process. The administrative system thus performs a significant role in the capability function of the political system both in its "input" and "output" aspects and links the polity to society.

The systems framework helps to provide an integrated perspective on administration by showing the linkages between the administration and its environment. It attempts to establish the relevance of public administration to politics, economics, and to other features of its environment that interest us as political scientists, economists or as citizens.

The Riggsian Model :   An Ecological Approach

F.W. Riggs has been primarily interested in conceptualizing the interactions between administrative systems and their environment. He maintains that an administrative system operates in the context of its socio-cultural, political and economic environment and there is a continuous interaction between the environment and the administrative system, both influencing mutually. This ecological model is the focal point of Riggsian analysis and has

20. ibid., p. 200.

been one of the most creative models in analysing the administration of developing countries.[21] In presenting his concepts, he has taken the help of structural-functional systems, and ecological approaches. The structural-functional approach considers structures as patterns of behaviour which have become standard features of a social system. Functions represent the interrelationships among various structures or the consequences of one structure over other structures. In Riggsian terms, the less number of functions a structure performs, the more "diffracted" it is, and conversely, the more functions a structure performs, the more "fused" it is. A combination of both creates "prismatic" structures.

A social system is a vast network of interrelated parts, each one of which can be understood in relation to other parts and to the whole system. Accordingly Riggs suggested that administrative structure and behaviour being an integral and interacting part of the entire society, could be comprehended properly only in the context of the social system in which it is embedded. The environment influences the system in the form of "inputs" which are "converted" into "outputs" by the system. Through a process of feedback, outputs cause the emergence of new inputs. The interaction between a system and its environment is characterised as an "ecological" interaction. Using the ecological approach, Riggs considers public bureaucracies as one of the several basic institutions in a society that interact with other sub-systems in a society, viz., the political, the economic, the social and the cultural systems. Riggs has particularly studied the differences in social, cultural, historical or political environment and their effect on administration. He has also studied as to how an administrative system affects the society of which it is a part. This interaction of the environment with administration has been termed by him as "ecology" of administration.

Development, according to Riggs, is a process of increasing autonomy (discretion) of social systems, made possible by rising levels of diffraction. The development level of a society is reflected in its ability to make decisions in order to control its environment. This decision-making capability is based on the level of diffraction in a society. Diffraction in turn, is a function of differentiation and integration. A high level of differentiation coupled with a high level of integration makes a society or a system diffracted. However, a low level of differentiation with corresponding level of integration makes a system "fused". Lastly, a high level of differentiation with a low level of integration makes a society "prismatic".

21. F.W. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1964, and *The Ecology of Public Administration*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1962.

Riggs views development administration as a goal-oriented administration—an administration which is engaged in the task of achieving progressive political, economic and social goals. In this context Riggs has presented the concept of "administrative development" which refers to the increase in the capabilities of an administrative system to achieve the prescribed goals.

Riggs has been primarily interested in social change and in understanding the process of transition in developing societies. Here a reference will be made to two of his typologies, first the "agraria-industria" typology and second the "fused-prismatic-diffracted" typology. In the first model Riggs differentiated two types of societies—societies where agricultural institutions dominated, and societies where industrial institutions were predominant. Riggs has identified certain structural features of agrarian societies, such as :[22]

1. There is a dominance of ascriptive, particular and diffuse patterns.
2. The local groups are stable and there is very limited spatial mobility.
3. Occupational differences are very simple and stable.
4. There exists a defferential stratification system of diffuse impact.

The chief features of an industrial society are the following :

1. There is a dominance of universal, specific and achievement norms.
2. The degree of social mobility is higher.
3. Occupational system is well developed and cut off from other social structures.
4. There is an egalitarian class system based on generalized patterns of occupational achievement.
5. Associations are functionally specific and nonascriptive in nature.

The "transitia" society represents a transitional stage of society between the agraria and the industria.

On the basis of empirical research Riggs later came out with his second model which constructs two ideal polar types :

(a) a refracted society where every function has a corresponding structure that specialises in its performance; and

(b) a fused society in which a single structure performs all functions.

22. Shum Shun Nisa Ali, *Eminent Administrative Thinkers*, Associated, New Delhi, pp. 103-104.

For example, in developed societies, the family performs certain social functions, the market performs the economic functions and the legislature and political parties perform political functions. In traditional societies, it is not unusual to see a few structures such as a family or a leader performing a whole set of functions like rule-making, rule adjudication, economic allocation, and even health administration. As society grows and develops, specialised structures increase in number, each one of which becomes engaged in specific functions. So, differentiation of structures is often viewed as the essence of development.

Riggs talked of the "prismatic" society as a midpoint between the two ideal types, combining the features of both, fused and refracted, that are characterised by heterogeneity (the simultaneous presence of quite different kinds of systems, practices and viewpoints) ; formalism (the extent to which discrepancy exists between formal structures and actual modalities, between the prescriptive and the descriptive, between impressions and real practices); and overlapping (the extent to which what is described as administrative behaviour is actually determined by non-administrative criteria.)

In a prismatic society pressure for change is external as well as internal. When it is external, it is termed "exogenous" and when internal, it is termed "endogenous". Riggs is of the view that greater formalism, heterogeneity and overlapping are likely to exist in an "exo-prismatic" society in comparison with an "endo-prismatic" one. Problems of formalism, heterogeneity and overlapping are faced by prismatic or transitional societies in their bid to assimilate social change in the shortest possible time.

The Riggsian approach tries to provide an integrated perspective on public administration in so far as he maintains that an administrative system operates in the context of its socio-cultural, political and economic environment and that the process of interaction between the environment and the administrative system is a continuous one. Both interact with and influence each other. He makes it very clear that "administration" is different in different social settings. He thereby focuses on the obvious nexus between the administrative system and the society in which it is embedded.

4

STRUCTURE OF ADMINISTRATION

Line, Staff and Auxiliary Agencies

Governmental work is done through an intricate and elaborate organization which is tied down in a single chain of command. The central hierarchy of this organization is called 'line' and those which fall on the margin are known as 'staff' and auxiliary agencies.

The term 'line' is drawn from military organization wherein line refers to command. The hierarchy which commands the military forces in the battlefield is known as line. Those agencies which help the commanders are known as 'staff' and 'auxiliary' agencies.

The distinction between the two kinds of services is essentially based on the type of work performed by the different branches or units of a department or agency. Most of the functions performed by the several divisions or units of an agency are regulatory or operational meant for the achievement of the departmental goals or purposes. All services of this nature are called line services. Besides, in any department or agency there are certain housekeeping, institutional or managerial activities without the performance of which the substantive function of the department cannot be achieved. These are known as staff.

In the departments of education, health and police, those divisions or units which perform the activities leading to the achievement of their purposes are line services. In the same departments or in the administrative branch as a whole there are certain services which help in planning the operations and give advice regarding the organization of personnel and finance and others. These organizations are known as staff services. In other words, line services are those which come in close contact with the people and the staff services are concerned with the routine activities of the government which are of little direct benefit to the people.

It is now realized that authority is more a matter of influence than of command and that both line and staff work are involved at most levels of operation. Further, as the number of staff officials multiplies along with the varieties of staff functions, some of the work shades off into the type of activity traditionally reserved for line officials. Hence staff work becomes in some degree a combination of both direct and indirect activity, including advice as well as direction to line officials.

Auxiliary agencies have been called by Willoughby as "institutional" or housekeeping services. Gaus names them "auxiliary technical staff services". L.D. White prefers to use the term "auxiliary services".

Auxiliary agencies serve the line departments but do not serve the public. They perform functions common to all the departments. A line agency to perform the primary duties for which it exists must provide itself with and maintain an office; establish and operate a system for the recruitment of its personnel; perform the work entailed in contracting, purchasing, storing, and issue of supplies and it must contain a system for keeping of accounts. These functions have now been organized under separate agencies called auxiliary agencies. The Government of India has four main auxiliary departments :

1. The Law Ministry
2. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
3. The Department of Parliamentary Affairs
4. The Central Public Works Department

Difference Between Staff and Auxiliary Services

Willoughby[1] draws a distinction between staff and auxiliary services.

1. The auxiliary services are operating services. Whether they are recruiting boards, purchasing agencies, or stationery stores, they perform some operation. But staff services are only thinking, observing, planning and advising agencies.

2. Auxiliary agencies are not concerned with major substantive policies, while the staff is concerned with the formulation of major policies and even with matters of reorganizing.

The two services are, however, similar in one respect. Both facilitate the work of the main operating agencies, namely, the line departments. They do not have a locus standi of their own.

Pfiffner and others do not distinguish between staff and auxiliary services. They define staff in such a way as to include auxiliary

1. W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration*, p. 95.

functions also. According to Pfiffner, staff are of three main kinds: general, technical and auxiliary. By 'general staff' he means the staff which helps the chief or other senior executive in his administrative work generally by advice, collection of information, research and sifting important issues from the unimportant. The technical staff consists of the technical officers such as engineers, doctors and financial experts. They advise the head in the technical matters of the departments. Under the third category, Pfiffner puts the auxiliary staff which comprises unit or officers who perform certain duties and functions common to the various administrative departments but which are incidental and/or of housekeeping nature. They are stationery, supply and disposals, recruitment of personnel and audit and accounts. As Pfiffner uses the term staff in a broad sense, he includes under this category, staff as well as auxiliary functions. He gives the following list of staff functions.

1. Advising.
2. Coordination.
3. Fact finding and research.
4. Planning.
5. Contact with other organisations and individuals to know what is going on.
6. Assisting the line working without, but without infringing its authority.
7. Sometimes, exercising specially delegated authority from the line commander, within clearly defined units.[2]

Staff, line, and housekeeping agencies are essential for the effective organization of government. Staff agencies engage in planning, research, and advice but do not carry on operational or managerial activities. Line agencies perform these basic or substantive functions and are able to accomplish their work more efficiently because they have the benefit of staff studies and housekeeping aids. Housekeeping agencies provide common services for all other agencies, for example, central purchasing, preparation and distribution of standard forms, printing, legal, financial, custodial, and other kinds of general assistance.

Line agencies can be of three kinds :

1. Departments,
2. Public corporations, and
3. Boards and Commissions.

1. The department is the largest and most prevalent form of administrative organization. It is directly under the chief executive

2.   Pfiffner and Presthus, *Public Administration*, pp. 183-185.

and is clearly held in a single chain of command. Thus, we find a lot of departments in a government, e.g., the department of home affairs, foreign affairs, defence, education, and health.

2. *The public corporation* is a new organizational device imported into public administration from private business administration. In private business, there are limited liability companies comprising a large number of shareholders, a board of directors representing the general body of shareholders and a general manager or managing director looking after the day to day administration of the company. Similarly, to carry on the business and industrial activities of the government, a company-like organization has been devised. It is called corporation and it functions, more or less, like the body of shareholders. It appoints a board of directors who are responsible for laying down the policies for the corporation. There is also a general manager who is responsible for the internal administration of the corporation. The corporation is a body corporate and holds property and cash in its own name. It can sue and be sued in a court of law. It enjoys the autonomy and flexibility of private enterprise coupled with accountability to the public (like government departments).

3. *Boards and commissions* have some features of the departmental form of organization and some others of the corporation form. At the top, they have a corporate structure, but internally they have a departmental structure.

Difference Between Line and Staff Agencies

The line agency is concerned with the primary functions of the organization for which it came into existence, and for which it continues to exist. On the other hand, a staff agency is concerned with the functions of planning, organization, coordination and advice. The need for a staff agency is felt in two principal areas of administration :

(1) management problems like that of organisation, personnel and coordination; and

(2) the substantive problems of policy formation and planning.

The main functions of the staff agency have been summarized by Dr. L.D. White in these words :[3]

(i) To ensure that the chief executive (and other top officials) is adequately and correctly informed.

(ii) To assist him in foreseeing problems and planning future programmes.

(iii) To ensure that matters for his decision reach his desk

3. L.D White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, p. 195.

promptly, in a condition to be settled intelligently and without delay and to protect him against hasty and ill-considered judgments.

(iv) To exclude every matter that can be settled elsewhere in the system.

(v) To protect his time.

(vi) To secure means of ensuring compliance by subordinates with established policy and executive directions.

While theoretically there is a clear distinction between the line function and the staff function, in actual practice it may be that the two functions may vest in one and the same person or body of persons. More particularly in a small organization the two functions are indistinct and also vest in the same person. In relation to his superiors, a person may be a staff official while in relation to his subordinates, he is a line officer. Similar is the case with technical organizations like the health, education, and the public works departments. In relation to the secretaries and the ministers the heads of these departments are merely staff officers. But within their own departments and directorates, they are line officers. Secondly, in terms of organization units the distinction between line and staff is relative rather than absolute. Complete separation of functions among distinct units of organization is impossible in practice. Therefore, when a unit or agency is called line or staff it only means that its functions belong predominantly to this class.

Departments

A department is the basic unit of organization in which the administrative branch as a whole is under the chief executive. Authority to organize departments may be vested in the constitution, the parliament, or the executive. In the USA the Congress regulates the details of public administrative organizations, the President is not free to reorganize the executive branch of the government as he likes. These restrictions, however, do not bind the British executive. The Ministers of Crown (Transfer of functions) Act, 1946, conferred on the British executive the power to organize and reorganize departments. In India, the creation and abolition of ministries and departments is an executive function, whereas in the Soviet Union this can be done only after an amendment of the constitution.

Advantages : The departmental system leads to a rational classification of governmental operations. A modern government has to perform multiple, diverse, and complicated functions. One cannot have a conception of the scope of governmental work and the agencies performing it in the absence of an integration of

related activities, falling within the same general fie!d. Specialization and integration of related functions are indispensable for simplification and rationalisation of governmental tasks and procedures. Secondly, grouping of services operating in the same general field helps in the formulation and implementation of a proper task programme. The chief executive can evolve a proper work programme only when he has to deal with a few chief subordinates, each of whom is made in charge of services falling in the same broad functional area. Similarly, the legislature too, can give proper consideration only if connected operations are arranged together. Thirdly, it helps the chief executive in exercising more effective control over administration, his attention now being restricted to a few departments. Fourthly, under the departmental system, conflicts of jurisdiction, overlapping of functions, and duplication of organization, plant and activities may be avoided. In several services, whose operations fall in the same field, are grouped in a department, they avail of the services of the single agency, which can now be better equipped. Sixthly, the grouping of related services departmentally brings about economy and efficiency in the performance of what are called institutional or housekeeping activities. The general character of the latter is the same for all services. Hence, performance by central agencies, of the housekeeping activities, results in economy and efficiency, and promotes standardization and uniformity of administrative processes.

A study of organizations reveals four different bases of departmental organization : (i) function or purpose, (ii) clientele, and (iii) area. According to Luther Gulick the four P's 'purpose, process, person, and place' are the bases of organization.[4]

(i) *Purpose* : Purpose means the major objective to be aimed at or major services to be performed. Functional division of work is very common, and is regarded by many as the only efficient method. Ministries of defence, education, transport and communications and railways in the Government of India have been formed on this basis.

(ii) *Process* : Process is identified with a technique, profession, of a somewhat specialized type, though it is to be admitted that it is not quite easy to differentiate between process and function. Ministry of Law in India manifests this principle. Generally, process or profession is considered the basis of staff organization rather than of line oranization.

(iii) *Clientele* : The principle of clientele, too, has been adopted as the basis of organization. The Department of Rehabilitation at the Centre and the Department of Tribal Welfare in some States in India have been formed on this principle. Similarly, the Office of

4. Luther Gulick, *Notes on the Theory of Organization*, p. 15.

Indian Affairs, and Veterans' Administration in the U.S.A., are the examples of clientele being the basis of organization. There is a possible justification for creating client-based organizations. Some groups in the community have distinctive problems, so special as to be differently dealt with. Hence separate departments are created for them. A clientele organization generally caters to all or most of the needs of the group served.

(iv) *Area or territory* : Area, that is, the place where a job is done, may be the basis of organization. Underlying this principle is the belief that a region may have problems peculiar to itself, lending it a distinctive character, and thereby favouring a separate handling or treatment. The now defunct North-East Frontier Agency (NEFA) in India, and the Office of the Secretary of State for Scotland in Britain indicate the adoption of this basis of organization. Also, at one level or another, most departments have their operating units organized on the area or territorial basis. The Ministry of Railways thus has nine territorial zones—Eastern, North-Eastern, North-East. Frontier, South-Eastern, South-Central, Northern, Eastern, Central and Southern. Zonal Councils too in India have been organized on this principle.

Bases of Departmental Organization

The work of the government is distributed among departments according to four possible bases, namely, function, process, clientele, and area. These bases are not alternative bases of organization. All the four bases or principles are pressed into service while dividing the work of government into departments. No single base, however, can be made the sole criterion of dividing the work. This can be illustrated by showing how the four bases have been employed for departmentalization in the Government of India.

<div align="center">Ministries</div>

1. Function :
   (i) Health and Family Welfare
   (ii) Education and Culture
   (iii) Labour
   (iv) Shipping and Transport
   (v) Defence

2. Process :
   (i) Law
   (ii) Works and Housing
   (iii) Steel and Mines

3. Clientele :
   (i) Department of Rehabilitation
   (ii) Ministry of Agriculture

4. Area :
   (i) External Affairs
   (ii) Indian Missions Abroad
   (iii) Regional Offices of the Director of Supply and Disposal

A strict adherence to the process principle would see members of different professions all grouped into separate departments on the sole basis of their profession. Certain activities cut across horizontally the functional departments, as the latter need them as part of their housekeeping activities. The execution of any given task would require cooperation of a large number of process departments. The clientele principle, discussed above, also has rigid limitations. Any wholesale application of this principle results in what the Haldane Committe called 'Lilliputian administration'. Again, the use of the territorial principle of organization ought to be confined to regions having problems so special or distinct that they (problems) need separate handling. To carry this to its logical conclusion could be to recreate problems of coordination. Finally, the functional principle too may lead to overlapping at times.

The different bases of organization are not mutually exclusive; these, in fact, should supplement one another, where necessary, for the sake of convenience and efficient execution of administrative tasks.

Types of Departments

Departments may differ in their size, structure, nature of work and internal relationship. From the point of view of size, a department may be large or small. For example, in the Union Government the ministries of Railways. Transport, Posts and Telegraphs, are very large, but the ministries of Education, Health, and Agriculture and the Department of Atomic Energy are small, for the simple reason that all of them except the last also have their counterparts in the States. Considering structure, a department may be unifunctional or multifunctional (federal). Unifunctional departments, that is, those created for the achievement of one major purpose such as education, defence, health, agriculture and labour are unitary in their structure performing homogeneous functions. But a federal or holding type department is multifunctional or federating, that is, several minor departments are combined into one large department. These departments function as subdepartments performing different functions. At present the Home Ministry in India is an amalgamation of a number of subdivisions and the Cabinet Secretariat has five departments under it.

According to their nature of work, many departments have operating duties, while a few perform only coordinating and supervisory duties. Examples of the former are the departments of Posts and Telegraphs, Railways, Defence, Police and Public Works, and the examples of the latter are Local Self-Government departments in the States, Ministries of Education, Health and Agriculture in the Union. Again, from the point of view of internal relationships, the work of a department may be mostly concentrated at the headquarters, so it need not have field agencies. But the work of many

departments is generally carried on in the regional and local offices besides the head offices.

The leadership of the department involves two important organisational issues—first, whether the head should be a single individual or a plural body, such as a board or commission; and, second, whether the chief qualification for headship should be administrative (managerial competence) or technical knowledge of the subject matter concerning the activities of the department.

So far as the second question is concerned, in the United States the heads of departments are generally persons having special knowledge of the subject. In Britain and India there are two kinds of heads—political and permanent. The minister is the political head and he is ordinarily a layman, not even necessarily possessing administrative competence. Under the minister there is the permanent head, that is, the secretary of a department. He is usually a man who possesses some knowledge of the subject matter and much administrative competence. As a political leader the department head is an indispensable link with the administration. He is expected to provide a certain political point of view to departmental operations. He also acts as an advisor to the prime minister both on specific duties which arise within the field of his assignment and also on broadly related fields. Finally, the department head must also serve as a connecting link between the permanent officials and the legislature as well as the chief executive. His task is one of ensuring proper consideration of both the political and departmental viewpoints in the preparation of departmental policies and programmes for the consideration of the chief executive. A department may be divided into branches, divisions, bureaux, sections and various other units of organisation.

According to Willoughby a standard scheme of departmental organisation would include : (1) Office of chief clerk; (2) Division of mail and files; (3) Division of personnel; (4) Division of supplies; (5) Division of accounts; (6) Division of printing and publications; (7) Office of the Superintendent of the building.

United Kingdom

The ministerial department is the key point of the British administrative system. Directly or indirectly all parts of the administrative machine, however autonomous in form, are under a minister who is responsible to Parliament for a department staffed by permanent civil servants. This applies equally to government departments, specially headed by ministers, to departments which have no ministerial head (but for all of which some minister is responsible, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer is for the Boards of Inland Revenue and Customs and Excise) and to semi-autonomous bodies like public corporations for which a minister will have ultimate responsibility even if it is not formally so wide ranging

as his government department. It is through the agency of government departments that government policy is formulated and implemented.

Since the first use of the term in 1915 the most common formal designations for a department and its political head have been ministry and minister respectively. The major British departments are Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Cabinet Office, Management and Personnel Office, Defence, Education and Science, Energy, Environment, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Industry, Trade, Transport, Treasury and Health and Social Security.

United States of America

The administrative organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government has administrative departments headed by secretaries. There are eleven departments, namely, Departments of State, Treasury, Defence, Justice, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labour, Transportation, Health, Education and Welfare, and lastly, the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The departments are functionally organised and are immediately below the Chief Executive, that is, the President. In the USA the Congress regulates the details of departmental organization; and the President is not free to reorganize the executive branch of the government, unlike the parliamentary systems in UK and India, where this power is vested constitutionally in the Chief Executive.

Soviet Union

The departmental form of governmental organization has been widely adopted in the Soviet Union. Government work is divided into functional departments which may be further subdivided into various divisions. All government departments come under ministries. Each ministry is headed by a minister who is the political head, whose immediate subordinate is a government bureaucrat who is the administrative head of the departments. Government departments in the Soviet Union fall under the ministries which are more than thirty in number. Law making, administration, as well as adjudication emanate from the Council of Ministers. The principle of separation of powers, though found in some degree in the Soviet government, is in theory repudiated.[5] However, the government is so structured that power is, in fact, divided. Rule making power, administrative authority, the power to supervise and control, and

5. A characteristic feature of the system of Soviet state organs is the unity and interconnection of all its component parts. The Soviet state organs do not oppose each other, are not isolated and self-contained organizations, on the contrary, there is constant interaction. *See* A. Denison and M. Kirichenko, *Soviet State Law* Moscow, 1960, p. 195.

various other functions are distributed among multiple agencies, each having jurisdiction over a broad or narrow sector of public life in the USSR. Thus there is what might be called a bureaucratic division of powers in the USSR which is a natural outcome of the complexity and multiplicity of governmental functions. Such division is therefore required for administrative efficiency.

The Council of Ministers, which heads government administration in the USSR has final authority in the organization of all ministers and cabinet level agencies. It is also the principal source of legislation in the Soviet Union. It is charged with the task of drawing up the national economic plans—from the five year to the shorter annual ones. The Council of Ministers draft the laws which go into effect after the Supreme Soviet formally ratifies them. Decrees or executive orders of the Supreme Soviet also have the binding of laws. The administration or execution of these laws is the task of the individual ministries and other cabinet level agencies attached to the Council of Ministers. It is also the task of the union republics constituting the Soviet Union.

The ministries and boards of the central government may be divided into two categories—those dealing with primarily economic matters and the non-economic ministries. For most of the non-economic ministries and state commissions, institutions analogous in jurisdiction and functions can be found in most western countries and elsewhere, for example, the ministries of Foreign Affairs and Defence, the Home Ministry and the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry of Finance functions as the nation's treasury department and tax collector, and shares budget making functions with such additional cabinet-level agencies as the State Bank, the State Economic Council and the State Planning Commission. An important agency attached to the Council of Ministers is the Commission of Soviet Control, which functions as a general inspectorate. Finally, among the most important non-economic ministries is the Ministry of Higher Education, which is directly in charge of all institutions of learning above the level of secondary schools. Often in the history of the USSR, other activities have been elevated to cabinet rank or demoted to the status of a department within an existing ministry. An example of this is the Civil Service Commission, which earlier existed within the Ministry of Finance, while at other times it has been directly subordinate to the Council of Ministers. Another non-economic agency which deserves mention is the Committee for State Security (KGB)—the political police of the government.

Among the ministries and boards dealing with economic problems some are general planning and service organisations : the State Planning Committee, the State Economic Council, the State Bank and the State Commission for Foreign Economic Relations. Other ministries and commissions which exert control over specific

branches of the economy are the Ministry of Merchant Marine which operates the commercial fleet ; the Ministry of Railroad Communications runs the railroads ; the Ministry of Postal Service and Telecommunications manages post offices and telephone exchanges and the Atomic Energy Commission whose task is to produce fissionable material.

All economic ministries have direct managerial functions for entire sectors of the economy. For almost each branch of industry or production, there is a ministry. These ministries are divided into divisions dealing with various branches of the industry. Under the command of each division are enterprises or combination of enterprises, some of the largest being designated as trusts. Directly or indirectly, therefore, all enterprises are subordinated, in a straight line of command, to the minister in charge of a particular branch of production. Each ministry headed by a minister is divided into departments or branches headed by deputy ministers or assistant ministers. A number of these highest civil servants form a small advisory group called the collegium. A minister today is obliged to consult his subordinates in the collegium, though he is not bound to follow their advice; at the same time, the collegium has the right to appeal against his decision to the Council of Ministers. Besides, a ministry may organise a large advisory council or ad hoc committees made up of senior civil servants of the staff, together with leading officials from the field. Like any national bureaucracy, a ministry will have a complex staff organization as well as field agencies. The organization of the staff, the number and kinds of departments and subdivisions, will naturally depend on the various activities the ministry is expected to undertake.

China

With few exceptions, each ministry, as well as many other ministry level organs in the central government in Beijing, operate as the command headquarters for a nationwide functional "system" which includes equivalent bodies performing similar work at each level of government, from the centre down to the local levels. These are grouped together into what might for convenience be labelled "general systems" which include at the national level several ministries, and often other agencies as well, whose work is closely related.

In the words of Doak Barnett, these systems have important characteristics—a distinct function or line of work; a vertical nationwide organizational structure with specialized institutions and personnel at each level of the administrative hierarchy into which China is divided, and distinct, centralized, special channels of authority and communication through which there is a direct flow of instructions from top to bottom as well as of reports from bottom to top.

Though there is still considerable difference of opinion as to which groupings of institutions and functions should be regarded as "general systems", it has been possible to identify ten major functional areas which possess most of the features noted above. They are :

1. Political and legal affairs
2. Culture and education
3. Agriculture, forestry and water conservancy
4. Industry and communications
5. Finance and trade
6. Party mass work
7. Foreign affairs
8. Women's and youth work
9. Military affairs
10. Organisational and personnel

The mojority of government ministries fit into one or another of these "general systems" and, as stated earlier, each also constitutes the apex of a vertical "system" of its own. It is the ministries which carry the main burden of day to day administration at the national level.

Ministers in China are obviously persons with broad responsibilities and high status in the bureaucracy. Each minister is responsible for supervising the entire work not only of his ministry but also of its subordinate regional counterparts throughout the country. In short, each minister heads one basic functional "system" into which government work is divided on a nationwide basis.

Boards and Commissions

A board or commission is defined as a group of people elected or appointed to discharge collectively some public function. A commission is also referred to as "certificate of office or a body of men to whom some public function has been entrusted."[6]

A board or commission is generally held desirable for the following :

(1) Those services which are of a quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative character, e.g., public utility corporations which perform two principal functions, viz., (a) quasi-legislative formulation of

---

6. H.J. Pandya, "Boards and Commissions in India", in Ramesh K. Arora (ed.), *The Indian Administrative System,* Associated Publishing House, 1978, p. 124.

rules and regulations for determining the rates and conditions of services; (b) quasi-judicial decisions of judgments on issues affecting public and private rights arising under such rules and regulations.

(2) Those services whose duties call for the exercise of wide discretionary powers of general control, for example, a Public Service Commission.

(3) Organization in which different interests are to be represented, e.g., commodity promotion board or conciliation board for the settlement of labour disputes.

(4) Such institutions where attempts are made to eliminate or reduce to a minimum the factor of party politics in the conduct of its operations.[7]

Merits

(i) It gives an opportunity to the administration to secure the advice and services of the best lay competence in the community at almost no cost.

(ii) It also tends to promote intelligent citizen cooperation and develop a sense of civil responsibility by enabling wider citizen participation in government.

(iii) Boards have grown up in welfare and educational activities in response to demands that these activities be freed from the political interference of the general government.

(iv) Commissions give an opportunity for representing different phases of opinion in the community.

Demerits

(i) Theoretically, the board administration violates the distinction between government and politics, because through it politics is injected into the administration.

(ii) It has been found that the personnel on boards or commissions have been, in many cases, rather mediocre, because while making appointments, authorities are concerned with either repaying political debts or in securing safe individuals.

(iii) If anything goes wrong, it is impossible to fix responsibility. Action is slowed down, and proper decisions are delayed or vitiated by compromise.

(iv) As compared to a bureau, a board or commission type of organisation is more expensive.

A board is a body of members who are required to act collectively. A 'Commission' is also a body of members, but they

7. W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration*, pp. 121-122.

act in two capacities. First, the members act collectively like those of a board; and secondly, each member also acts individually as head of a distinct branch of organisation. The common examples are those of a municipal board, and commission type organisation of a local body as in the USA. According to Graves the term 'Commission' is to be used when the body is charged with important regulatory duties relating to public utility enterprises. Where the duties are primarily administrative or where, if regulatory in character, they relate to matters other than public utilities, the 'board' is in general use.

Composition of Boards and Commissions

They may be composed of (i) members serving full time and entitled to compensation like other similar government servants; (ii) private members receiving no compensation as they are required to give only a small part of their time; (iii) ex-officio members, holding other offices. When duties are numerous, part-time members, should not be appointed. There are usually three to nine members. All the members may be appointed simultaneously for a fixed term normally of three to five years or, one-half, or one-third retiring, and new ones being appointed in their places every alternate years or so.

India

Since Independence many boards and commissions have been established in India. These can be classified into three broad categories on the basis of their origin.

(a) *Constitutional commissions* : Our Constitution makes a mention of some of the commissions that have to be appointed. Such commissions are : the Finance Commission, the Backward Classes Commission, and the Official Language Commission. Because of the constitutional sanctity attached to these commissions, they enjoy the greatest autonomy. They are appointed by the President of India and do not come under the purview of any executive authority. The members of these commissions are appointed by the President but they cannot be removed from office except by a special procedure. Their salaries are charged on the Consolidated Fund of India and cannot be reduced during the term of their office.

(b) *Statutory commissions/boards* : The statutory commissions/boards are set up by the Acts of Parliament. Examples of such bodies are : the University Grants Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Railway Board, the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and the Flood Control Board. The statutory boards or commissions function under the general administrative control of one or the other ministries of the Government of India but enjoy autonomy in their own administrative work. The departmental procedures are not applied by them in the conduct of their

work except when they voluntarily opt for them. Such boards and commissions exist in the state governments also.

(c) *Boards/commissions set up by executive orders* : There are boards and commissions which are set up by an order of the executive, that is, the Central or State governments. Examples of such bodies are : the Handicrafts Board, the Handloom Board, the Central Social Welfare Board, the Central Water and Power Commission. Such boards and commissions enjoy much less autonomy than the constitutional and statutory boards and commissions. They are generally attached to the concerned minister who has the power to regulate their conduct of business and even abolish them altogether.

United Kingdom

Boards and commissions have become an increasingly important feature of the central administrative system as the government has extended its direct intervention in the economic activity and as social provision has expanded. Some of the examples are the Monopolies Commission, Agricultural Marketing Boards, the British Standards Institution, Council for Industrial Design, Commission for Racial Equality, Equal Opportunities Commission, Manpower Services Commission

United States of America

In the USA the board and commission type of organization is widely used. This is partly due to the loseness of the American administrative system, and partly due to a desire to escape the pervasive influence of party politics in administration.

Some of the important boards are : Civil Aeronautics Board, National Labour Relations Board, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, National Mediation Board, National Transportation Safety Board.

Independent Regulatory Commissions

The independent regulatory commissions are peculiar to the constitutional set-up of the United States of America. They are a progeny of the separation of powers and the deep distrust of the Congress in the powers of the American presidency. The need for such commissions was felt on account of the growing industrialization and urbanization of the country during the nineteenth century when the government felt it imperative to regulate private economic activities. The first independent regulatory commission, set up by the Federal Government, was the Inter-State Commerce Commission in 1887. At present there are eleven such commissions in the Federal Government of the USA which are as under :

1. The Inter-State Commerce Commission.

2. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
3. The Federal Trade Commission.
4. The Federal Communications Commission.
5. The Federal Power Commission.
6. The Securities and Exchange Commission.
7. The National Labour Relations Board.
8. The United States Maritime Board.
9. The Civil Aeronautics Board.
10. US Tariff Commission.
11. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

The main functions of these commissions can be summarized. First, they set standards, rules and regulations to govern the behaviour of a particular industry, and secondly, they enforce these standards, rules and regulations and prosecute the defaulters. They, therefore, enjoy both the powers to make administrative legislation and to adjudicate administrative disputes. They regulate the economic activities in three different procedures : (a) make rules, that is, elaborate and define the general norms laid down in the parent Acts; (b) administrative methods such as licensing, inspection, publicity; and (c) case-by-case decision method which is used on complaints against the violation of the law or the norms laid down.

The commissions can hear cases and award decisions either on a regular petition having been made by a private party or on their own initiative. The power to take initiative is the main distinguishing feature which differentiates the commissions from the ordinary courts. The ordinary courts cannot start judicial proceedings at their own initiative. As soon as a commission takes the initiative on its own or on a petition from a private party, it issues notices to the party or parties concerned. The next step is the hearing of the case. The commission is not bound by the formal rules of evidence and whatever relevant evidence can assist it in fact-finding is accepted. Nor is it essential that the petition must be heard by the person who is to ultimately decide the case. The usual procedure is that the case is heard by over a dozen examiners and on the basis of relevant evidence, a decision is recommended to the head of the commission. Generally, the head of the commission simply endorses the decision of the examiners. Judicial review of, and appeals against these decisions again rest with the commission which sits as an administrative tribunal in respect of these decisions.

Main Features

1. The functions of independent regulatory commissions are of a mixed nature—administrative, quasi-legislative, and quasi-judicial. They frame rules and regulations, execute these rules and

hear appeals against their own decisions. It is on account of the mixed nature of their functions that they have been called "the fourth branch of the government" for they do not fit into any of the three traditional branches of the government—legislative, executive and judicial.

2. These commissions are staffed by experts and are relatively small.

3. They are collegial in character and consist of a group of men who discuss and decide by a majority vote.

4. They are relatively independent of the Chief Executive, i.e., the President. They are neither responsible to him nor have to report to him. They are set up under a statute passed by the Congress laying down their constitution and functions. It is because of these reasons that these commissions have been described as "headless" for they owe no subordination to the President or any other executive authority. In fact, they are outside the framework of the departmental organization under the President and have been rightly called "islands of autonomy" within the American administrative set-up. The federal administration of the USA stands "disintegrated" because of the presence of these commissions.

It may, however, be mentioned that the independence of these regulatory commissions is relative and not absolute. First, they are controlled by the Civil Service Commission in personnel administration. Secondly, their budgets are subject to the review of the Office of Management and Budget which is a staff agency of the American President. Thirdly, their actions are subject to judicial review and can be declared void. Finally, they are subject to the control of the Congress. They receive their annual appropriations from the Congress, which has the power to order an investigation into their working and operations. The Congress can also amend their constitutions, and even abolish them, although the last step has never been taken. As a matter of fact the control of the Congress is only of a general character and these commissions are regarded as "the arms of the Congress". On the whole, these commissions are largely autonomous.

The regulatory work of the administration is usually done by the various government departments, corporations and local bodies, in most countries. Even in the USA most of the regulatory work is done by the departments, local bodies and such other agencies. In India, one is well familiar with the rules and regulations regarding construction of buildings and zoning, framed by the municipal bodies. What distinguishes these bodies from the independent regulatory commissions is the status of the latter in being outside the purview of the Chief Executive.

Merits

The merits were clearly brought out by the Hoover Commission Task Force on regulatory commissions which observed :[8]

> The number of members and their security of tenure are intended to assure freedom from partisan control or favouritism. The group is able to resist outside influence more effectively than an individual and each member is free from a threat of removal as a source of pressure. Moreover, since the activities of the commission may be more subject to public scrutiny than would be a single bureau in a large department, there is greater opportunity for exposure of pressures or improper actions. Finally, while provisions for hearings and similar safeguards against arbitrary actions are not peculiar to commissions, they may be more effective when combined with group action.

Demerits

1. It is said that the regulatory commissions owe no responsibility to any constituted authority. They function outside the administrative set-up of the President and have been rightly called "headless". The President has no power to dismiss any of the members with the result that they can easily stand in the way of effective and integrated administration of the Chief Executive.

2. The commissions combine in themselves the functions of the legislator, prosecutor, and the judge, thereby jeopardising the rights and liberties of the people. The commissions formulate very important policies in business and industrial fields and with these combined functions, can easily act arbitrarily.

3. As these commissions are outside the purview of the President, they have served as a great "disintegrating" force in the federal administration of the USA. They can obstruct effective co-ordination of the national policy by non-cooperating with other departments of the federal government. Besides, there usually arise conflicts of jurisdiction between these commissions and other executive departments because some of the regulatory functions are common to both these bodies. This can result in "a decentralized and chaotic administration."

It is clear that there is no unanimity of opinions about the utility of these commissions. It appears that the Americans have accepted their existence as a matter of fact. Under the circumstances, what is needed is that Congressional as well as judicial control over them should be strengthened. James W. Fesler has made the

---

8. The Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions, p. 20.

remove them is well recognized in most countries. In India, all the Public Corporation Acts empower the Government to appoint chairmen and members of the board as well as managing directors and general managers. These Acts do not lay down any qualifications for selection to these posts, leaving the minister with considerable discretion in the matters.

2. It is a well established principle of public corporations that matters of broad policy are the concern of the minister while matters of day-to-day administration are left to the discretion of the corporation. However, in practice there is no clear line of demarcation between the two spheres. Therefore, all Public Corporation Acts provide that the government shall have the power to issue policy directives to the corporations from time to time. And to enable the government to keep a watch over policy execution of these corporations, the Acts also require them to submit periodical reports, returns and other information to the government. The minister may himself ask for any information at any time and the corporation has to supply it to him even though it may relate to matters of detailed administration. The approval of the minister is also necessary for the new schemes and programmes of the corporation if they involve policy matters and important financial considerations.

Financial control : Besides annual statements of accounts and audit reports of public undertakings there are other ways of government control in India.

The Finance Ministry has a great control over the enterprises. In the first place, it is represented on the boards of directors of all the corporations. Secondly, to certain corporations, it also sends a financial advisor, whose approval is necessary on all financial transactions. In certain financial matters government approval is also necessary for undertaking works of a capital nature involving expenditure of more than a specified sum.

Public Corporations in UK

There are over fifty public corporations in the UK, inclusive of the nineteen nationalised industries. The major public corporations are the British Broadcasting Corporation, Civil Aviation Authority, Commonwealth Development Corporation, Housing Corporation, National Film Finance Corporation, National Ports Council and National Research Development Corporation.

The general pattern of the relationship between boards of nationalised industries and public corporations and the Parliament in UK, can be summarised as follows :

(1) The minister appoints and has the power to dismiss the chairman and members of each board. He has the power to give general directions on how the industry shall be run but does not interfere in everyday management. Boards are normally required to provide the minister with any information, statistics or financial accounts which he may require.

(2) As far as financial matters are concerned, the usual statutory requirement is for the board to conduct its business so that its accounts are in balance taking one year with another. Some of the corporations are self-supporting and realise considerable annual profits; others receive Exchequer grants to enable them to discharge their responsibilities effectively. Financial targets are set in agreement with the minister.

(3) The Government has to answer in Parliament for its policy concerning the nationalised industries. Opportunities for parliamentary discussion are afforded by debates, especially the debates on the Annual Reports and Accounts for each industry, and parliamentary questions. The minister is only responsible for answering questions concerned with general policy and not with matters of day-to-day administration. The Select Committee on Nationalised Industries plays the most important role in highlighting problems affecting the developments of public corporations.

Public Corporations in USA

In the USA public corporations were created for three purposes : (i) During the Depression to facilitate the extension of credit to financially needy banking, insurance, transportation, manufacturing and other private companies; (ii) to carry on enterprises of a business or commercial nature; and (iii) to deal with emergency problems that arose in certain industries which necessitated government intervention. In 1948 President Truman indicated in his budget message the following four criteria for the creation of public corporations :

1. When a government programme is essentially of a commercial nature involving business type public transactions.

2. When it is a revenue producing (or profit-making) venture requiring greater flexibility and autonomy than normal business enterprises.

Public control over government corporations in the USA takes many forms. Due to the presidential form of government congressional control over these corporations is more limited than in countries like India. Public corporations had enjoyed in the early period of their growth a great deal of autonomy in financial matters as they were independent of the financial control of the Congress. However, over the years, various statutes like the First

Deficiency Act 1936, the Ramspeck Act 1940, and the Corporation Control Act 1945 have considerably limited the unbridled autonomy these corporations enjoyed earlier. By the First Deficiency Act, Congress necessitated compulsory review of administrative expenses even though the Congress was not authorized to sanction these expenses. By the Ramspeck Act the President was given discretionary power to subject federal corporations to civil service laws. The Corporation Control Act provided for the assimilation of the budget and audit system of public corporations (except the Tennessee Valley Authority) with those of government departments.

As a result of the enactments, public corporations in the USA (except Tennessee Valley Authority and Port of New York Authority) are now completely under the budgetary and administrative control of the Executive and also under the detailed review of the Congress. The major public corporations in the USA are Commodity Credit Corporation, Export Import Bank of Washington, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, Federal Prison Industries, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Panama Canal Corporation, Postal Service, Tennessee Valley Authority and Port of New York Authority.

Public Enterprises in the Soviet Union

In the Soviet Union public enterprises embrace not only utilities but almost the whole of industrial production, commerce and finance.

All public enterprises are owned and managed by the State. In the USSR industrial enterprises, factories, mines, oil wells, and shops at the union, republican or local levels are managed respectively by ministries at the federal, republican and executive committee level of local soviets. The basic unit of production is the individual enterprise (comprising one factory or more) which is an integrated operation under a single manager. All employees of public enterprises scientists, technicians and engineers or others are public officials, with fixed salaries. All nationalized industries are grouped in related combines, each of which is given separate economic status. The state treasury allocates to each group of industries such nationalized property as is necessary to its functioning and this property is inventoried and attached as a schedule of property to a "charter" in which the purposes for which the corporation or trust, as the enterprise may be called, is created are enumerated. At the head of the trust there is usually a single individual named by the ministry under which the enterprise is to function. Wages are set in collective bargaining arrangements arranged by the management with labour unions and under the guidance of the Communist party. The corporation or the trust is expected

to make a profit between the planned costs and the planned selling price. Each corporation or enterprise is charged with property responsibilities and held accountable for its property through a system of cost accounting. It could sue and be sued as a corporate entity. The manager of a Soviet industrial enterprise has at his disposal all the material and monetary resources of the enterprise, and directly manages the drafting of workshop tasks (technical, industrial and financial plans) and the plans for its technical progress and capital expansion. The manager selects all the basic personnel, establishes work procedures, and maintains labour discipline. He has to bear the entire responsibility for the work of an enterprise. The primary industrial producing unit is the factory or plant, normally referred to in Soviet terminology as the enterprise. It is a business organisation in that it not only produces goods or services, but also purchases raw materials, sells its product, hires and fires its employees, and seeks to make a profit. Within this general format, the enterprise has a measure of choice in decision making and a certain amount of administrative flexibility, for example, in the use of its financial resources to achieve its assigned goals. On the other hand it must fulfil its plan, and its actions at all times are subject to the continuous review and supervision of local and central party, government and economic agencies. The profits are intended to keep the enterprise on a financially self-sustaining basis. Profits (income after deducting expenses and planned charges) are important sources of state revenue, constituting perhaps one-fifth of the entire national budget. The enterprise director's fund also is taken from the profits. This fund is an important source of additional money avilable to the director for the purpose of covering enterprise losses, improving services and benefits to the worker, expanding production facilities, increasing capital, granting bonuses and for other uses such as paying interest on loans.

Public Enterprises in China

Public enterprises in China are both large capital intensive enterprises, and small labour intensive factories organised on a territorial management production basis. Management of economic operations is mostly concentrated at the commune level (small scale industrial projects) and the principal level (large scale industrial projects), each supervising the operations of the level immediately below it. The centre has given all territorial levels of the administrative hierarchy the right to start factories and organise the industrial network in their area. This does not mean that the centre waives all power and control over such factories, but in addition to financial responsibility for their management, the province or a commune gets a share of the profits, besides sharing responsibility with the centre for acquiring raw materials, and having a say in the objectives and use of their output. The percentage of national production which now comes under provincial or commune management is almost fifty.

Many units engage in factory supervision. Each may specialize in certain types of planning problems: supply, sales, production planning, labour allocation, capital construction, finance, or statistics, to list a few. These supervisory bodies can be grouped into two major categories. The first comprises the local representatives of central government organs (such as ministries), while the second is made up of local representatives of the administrative level which controls an enterprise (such as a province or country).

The Chinese refer to this system as "dual control".

Industrial ministries play an important role in the allocation of supplies, investment funds, skilled labour, and other critical resources ; the planning, design, and supervision of major construction projects, setting technical standards and prices for their products; research and development of new technology; and the training of technical specialists.

The system of "dual" control is supposed to work in this manner; the horizontal levels of government below the centre, including the provinces, municipalities, and counties are empowered to cut across the "vertical" lines of control emanating from ministries and other planning bodies in the capital. There is joint control by local authorities in cooperation with the field representatives of central government organs. This was done to enable the industrial management policies of the central government to be modified through local participation, whenever necessary. The entire scheme of industrial management in China was meant to strike a balance between centralization and decentralization.

Bureaux and corporations: The increased participation of local authorities in industrial management[13] led to the creation of two important kinds of specialized bodies, bureaux and corporations, both of which are modeled after ministries. Some units appear to have been established in every large industrial city in China. The bureaux specialize in different industrial areas, such as iron and steel, textiles, machine tools, trade and capital construction among others. The corporations are normally subordinate to bureaux and tend to oversee more specialized industrial activities, such as the manufacture of certain types of machine tools. In general, the corporations are responsible for purely technical operations and are directly above most enterprises, each may supervise about ten enterprises.

Generally, the increased jurisdiction of local authorities has meant a tighter control over factory management. The most important tasks of administering the factories are entrusted to the factory directors, and administrative cadres in the enterprises

13. For details on industrial management, planning and administration see *Encyclopaedia of China Today*, Macmillan, London, 1979, pp. 176-178.

themselves. The factories have the power to recruit their own personnel and sign contracts for procurement of raw materials and selling their products. In the Chinese industry one of the most common forms of decision making advocated is the "triple combination" in which technical problems are solved by ad-hoc groups composed of cadres, technicians and workers. Planning apparently entails extensive negotiations and hard bargaining between the factory leadership and the higher authorities.

The organisational structures of public enterprises in China differ from factory to factory. The key person in each factory is the factory manager; only the largest factories have deputy managers. The larger enterprises also have personnel cadres, an accountant, at least one clerk, and one or more production management cadres. Other technical or specialised personnel varies from factory to factory.

Workers in public enterprises are classified as either ordinary or technical workers and are paid according to graded wage scales.

Staff Agencies in India, UK, USA, USSR and China

India

Staff agencies in India include the Cabinet Secretariat, the Prime Minister's Office (known as Prime Minister's Secretariat till June 1977), the Cabinet Committees, the Planning Commission, the Budget and Economic Affairs Department in the Finance Ministry, the Administrative Vigilance Division in the Home Affairs Ministry, and the Staff Inspection Unit (S.I.U) in the Finance Ministry.

Cabinet Secretariat : The Cabinet Secretariat performs staff functions, serving the Cabinet as well as the standing committees of the Cabinet. It performs the necessary secretariat work pertaining to the meetings of the Cabinet and its committees. Its functions include preparation of agenda for the meetings of the Cabinet, keeping record of discussions in the Cabinet and the decisions taken, circulation of memoranda on issues awaiting the Cabinet's approval, circulation of the decisions to each ministry, preparation and submission of monthly summaries on a large number of specified subjects to the Cabinet.

The Cabinet Secretariat functions under the direct charge of the Prime Minister and is headed by a functionary called the Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet Secretary is the seniormost civil servant and is the principal adviser to the Prime Minister.

Prime Minister's Office : The Prime Minister's Office assists the Prime Minister in his public activities in that capacity and in his functions as the head of Government within the general framework of established government procedure. Generally, the status of the officers of the Prime Minister's Secretariat can be taken to

be the same as status of officers of the corresponding rank in the ministries of the Government.

Cabinet Committees : The Cabinet carries on much of its work through its committees which generally have the authority to give binding decisions on matters assigned to them. Any decision of a committee may, however, be reviewed by the Cabinet. The decisions arrived at by the committees are reported to the Cabinet for information. Ordinarily, no matter comes before the Cabinet unless it has been considered by the concerned committee of the Cabinet.

These committees facilitate effective coordination and quick decisions in addition to relieving the Cabinet of considerable amount of preliminary work, leaving it free to concentrate upon more important matters. They are of two types—the standing and the ad hoc committees. An ad hoc committee may be appointed by the Cabinet or the Prime Minister for investigating and reporting to the Cabinet on specific matters and, if so authorized, to give even binding decisions on such matters. The membership of the Cabinet Committee varies from three to eight. Their chairmanship is shared between the Prime Minister and the Home Minister.

Planning Commission : Established by a Government resolution in March 1950, the Planning Commission, with the Prime Minister as the Chairman, soon emerged as a powerful and effective staff agency in India. The functions of the Commision are as follows:

(1) Make an assessment of the material, capital and human resources of the country, including technical personnel, and investigate the possibilities of augmenting such of these resources as are found to be deficient in relation to the nation's requirements.

(2) Formulate a plan for the most effective and balanced utilization of the country's resources.

(3) Determine priorities as between projects and programmes accepted in the plan.

(4) Indicate the factors that retard economic development, and determine conditions which should be established for the success of the plan.

(5) Determine the nature of the machinery for successful implementation of the plan.

(6) From time to time appraise with the progress of the plan and recommend the necessary adjustments of policies and measures.

(7) Make recommendations after considering the economic conditions, policies, measures and development programmes, or after examining problems referred to it for advice by the Central or

State Governments or for facilitating the discharge of duties assigned to it.

The Planning Commission at present consists of the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and six members. The Prime Minister is its Chairman. The Deputy Chairman is the full time functional head of the Commission. Of the six members three are ministers in the Central Government—the Finance Minister, the Home Minister and the Defence Minister. The remaining three are full time members. Each member looks after one or more subjects and directs the study of problems in his field, but all the members function as a body. All cases involving policy are considered by the Commission as a whole. The formulation of plans, adjustments in the plans, matters involving departure from the plan policies, important cases involving disagreement with a Central ministry or a State Government, and difference of opinion between two members are some of them.

Other staff agencies in India are the Budget and Economic Affairs Department in the Ministry of Finance, Vigilance Division in the Ministry of Home Affairs, and the Staff Inspection Unit in the Ministry of Finance. The Department of Economic Affairs, primarily concerned with the formulation of the financial policy of the Central Government, looks after a diversified group of subjects, like banking, currency, capital issues, public debt, foreign exchange, balance of payments, consolidation and preparation of central budgets, review of state budgets and technical assistance programmes. The Administrative Vigilance Division provides a centralized drive, direction and coordination regarding the battle against corruption in the public services. Each ministry and department has a Vigilance Officer, and the Director, Administrative Vigilance Division, acts as the chief guide and co-ordinator of the combined operations. The Vigilance Office is responsible for:

(a) examining all aspects of the work with a view to locate points where opportunity for corruption is likely to arise; for organizing regular and surprise inspections and devising other ways and means for minimizing the scope for corruption; and

(b) initiating prompt action and pursuing it with speed and vigour when there appear to be reasonable grounds for suspicion of corruption or malpractices against individual officers.

The Staff Inspection Unit, constituted in April 1964, replaced the Special Reorganization Unit which had been in existence since 1953. The Staff Inspection Unit is located in the Department of Expenditure (Ministry of Finance), and it is charged with (i) securing economy in staff consistent with administrative efficiency, and (ii) evolving performance standards and work norms. The function of the Staff Inspection Unit is to keep the staff position in ministries/offices under the Central Government

under constant review in accordance with predetermined programmes of work measurement studies. It also undertakes ad hoc reviews, on special requests of ministries/offices not included in the programme as well as of public sector undertakings.

Britain

The Treasury in the UK has been described as the executive agency through which the authority of the Chancellor of Exchequer is imposed on the operation of all departments of state.

The British Treasury as the Department of the Prime Minister has three important aspects. First, it performs some important general service functions. Secondly, the Permanent Secretary to the Treasury is the principal adviser to the Prime Minister, who has an overall concern with the entire business of the state. When a vacancy arises in the high posts of any department, he submits advice for the consideration of the Prime Minister and of the minister of the department concerned with regard to that appointment. Thirdly, the Treasury is related to the cabinet secretariat, which is especially attached to the Prime Minister. In addition to these aspects, the Organisation and Methods Division of the Treasury plays an important part in effecting economies of time, effort and materials through the introduction of improved methods and procedures.

Another important staff agency in Britain is the Cabinet Secretariat, which was established during the First World War in 1916. This office serves both the Cabinet and the cabinet committees. Its main functions are: preparation of the agenda for meetings of the Cabinet and its committees; circulation of memoranda, other papers and reports on the implementation of decisions; keeping the non-cabinet ministers informed of the results of cabinet discussions affecting their departments; and keeping all important records of discussions held and decisions made at Cabinet meetings.

United States of America

The executive office of the President is made up of the White House Office, the Office of Budget and Management, the National Security Council, the Office of Defence Mobilization, the Council of Economic Advisers, and some other agencies, like the General Accounting Office and the Office of Economic Stabilization.

White House Office: The White House Office covers the entire range of presidential functions. Consisting of personel assistants, appointed by the President, this office performs all those functions that assist him in the everyday running of his office. The office analyses the problems confronting him and assists him in taking decisions. It transmits his decisions and orders to the departments, thus becoming an essential link between the latter and the President. Also, it is this office which, as the representative of the President, deals with the partymen, members of the Congress, and private groups.

Office of Budget and Management : The Office of Budget and Management, known until recently as the Bureau of Budget, created by the Budget Accounting Act of 1921, has become an arm of the overhead management. Its primary duty is to assist the President in the preparation and execution of the annual budget. Besides, it subjects all the executive orders, proposals for legislation, originating from the executive branch, and bills coming from the Congress to review and analysis. It suggests the schemes for better organization and management of agencies and departments of the executive branch. It also coordinates the federal statistical activities. The Office of Budget and Management works through offices for budget review, legislative reference, management and organization, and statistical standards.

National Security Council : Set up by the National Security Act of 1947, the National Security Council advises the President on the integration of military, foreign and domestic policies pertaining to national security; assesses and appraises the objectives, commitments and risks of the United States in relation to the country's military power, and considers policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of the governments. The Council only studies and advises, the President takes the decision.

The office of the Defence Mobilization, dealing with national security, engages in mobilization planning and executes the plans in times of emergency.

The Council of Economic Advisers, established in 1946, assists the President in preparing his annual economic report which is presented to the Congress, and submits to him information on economic matters.

Soviet Union

Every ministry in the USSR has a research institute to assist, guide and provide latest information and technology for policy making and execution. Thus the Ministry of Agriculture has a research institute on agricultural economics, the Procuracy (Office of the Prosecutor General) has an institute on the causes of crime and measures to prevent it, the State Committee on Prices has one on price determination and so forth. Similarly, each ministry has educational institutions to prepare the middle level personnel it needs, for example, the Ministry of Agriculture has over one hundred colleges which it supervises.

The staff of these scientific and educational institutions often work on technical problems, but many also study problems directly relevant to the policy concerns of the ministry. As a result, the top administrators of the major governmental institutions have a great deal of within house scientific expertise at their disposal if they wish to utilise it either for policy study or augmentation in a policy.

The State Committee that has special responsibility for coordinating and controlling the actions of the ministries is the State Planning Committee or Gosplan. It engages not only in long term planning but also in the extremely detailed compilation of the annual plan. The primary function of Gosplan is to reconcile the various ministerial requests within the framework of available resources and priorities. It produces four balances—(a) the overall economy, (b) labour resources, (c) finance and currency, and (d) material resources. To carry out its functions, Gosplan has two types of internal departments. The "summary" departments supervise the overall balances, territorial planning and the like. The branch departments are structured along the same general lines as the ministries. Gosplan has four research institutes, the officials of which not only conduct research and calculations needed in the compilation of the plan but also participate in the published policy debate. Another staff agency in the USSR is the Civil Service Commission which acts as the chief adviser to the government on policy matters pertaining to personnel administration. Other important government bodies performing research and advisory functions (essentially staff functions) are the State Committee for Science and Technology and State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. Most of these bodies, however, have operational responsibilities as well.

China

At the highest level the overall framework for planning was established according to policies and goals defined by such top party and government authorities as the Party Central Committee, the Politburo, the Politburo Standing Committee, and the State Council. On the basis of the plans and policies the State Planning Commission is responsible for working out long-term plans, and the State Economic Commission is responsible for short-term ones. Every ministry has its Planning Bureau, Statistical Bureau, Bureau of Finance and Accounting which acts as a staff agency in the ministry. Each one is in charge of providing specialized research, knowledge and advice on planning, statistical and financial work related to the ministry. Most ministries have large special cadre schools providing specialized training relevant to their work. There are also independent personnel training institutes involved in cadre training.

There are six major staff offices in China. They are:

1. The Staff Office for Foreign Affairs
2. The Staff Office for Political and Legal Affairs
3. The Staff Office for Culture and Education
4. The Staff Office for Industry and Communication
5. The Staff Office for Finance and Trade
6. The Staff Office for Agriculture and Forestry

5

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA, SOVIET UNION AND CHINA

India

The Indian administrative system as it exists today is a product of two different sets of influences; the British colonial administrative traditions and the ideals of democratic welfare state which was constitutionally adopted in India after independence. Among India's colonial legacies, perhaps the most well developed institution which the British left behind was the Indian Civil Service (ICS). The Indian Civil Service consisted of an exclusive administrative elite, selected on merit who were exceptionally devoted to duty, but were by interest and training, the main supporters of British imperialism. Colonial administration in India was authoritarian, unresponsive, exclusive and paternalistic in character, qualities which the civil servants were taught to imbibe and maintain in their dealings with the public. Primarily performing regulatory functions like maintenance of law and order, collection of revenue, the administration during the British period had practically no developmental tasks to perform or welfare goals to achieve. The civil service was a very powerful body with powers of policymaking and execution vested in their hands to a great extent. However, though the colonial government was involved in minimal welfare functions (construction of roads, railways, educational institutions and hospitals, to name a few), the ICS men served to some extent as an integrating force, in a country with multiple diversities such as India. They were efficient though bureaucratic in approach.

This was the legacy which India inherited at the time of independence: a generalist civil service trained in routine regulatory functions and in the rigid application of rules, unused to the task of nation-building or social reconstruction and without any institutionalised system of accountability to the people. However, it must be stated that the inherited bureaucracy had many merits. During the colonial era the foundation of a modern educational system

capable of providing a pool of future administrative personnel was there, besides a network of communications, that is, schools, colleges, banks and the press which provided the basic requirements in developing an infrastructure of a modern nation.

Evolving Administrative System

The advent of independence and the resulting political and social changes constituted the second set of influences on the administrative system of the country. The adoption of a democratic social welfare state brought with it the concept of welfare administration and public accountability which necessitated considerable changes in the structure and functioning of the colonial mode of administration. In the changed environment, bureaucracy was expected to be subservient to its political masters, act as the major instrument of social change and be accountable to the people and responsive to their needs and aspirations. India launched massive five year plans meant to eradicate poverty and backwardness through rational and comprehensive state efforts. The state became the major promoter of planned change. The government adopted as its goal a social welfare state and embarked on an ambitious programme of nation-building and rapid socio-economic development. The nature of governmental goals and tasks, therefore, underwent a qualitative change. These expanding frontiers and the new tasks of government required an efficient and capable government machinery to handle social, economic, political and technological problems in the context of development administration. The entire emphasis of bureaucratic functions shifted from regulatory to that of individual and community welfare. A suitable administrative structure was, therefore, required to plan and implement the various tasks undertaken by the government.

Unfortunately, however, despite the changed socio-economic and political milieu after independence, the influence of the earlier colonial system continues to dominate the Indian scene. The structural characteristics of the Indian Civil Service during the British period, an open entry system based on recruitment by merit, permanency of tenure, dominance of generalist administrators at all levels of the administrative hierarchy, a regular graded scale of pay with promotions based predominantly on seniority have all been retained with only minor modifications. Some of the new leaders, no doubt, expressed their grave misgivings over adoption of a post-independent bureaucratic structure with no major changes. They felt that development administration needed a new structural and behavioural orientation. This demand was, however, ultimately resisted by a stronger lobby within the political leadership who on the contrary being great admirers of the 'steel-frame' (the civil service structure) felt that the British pattern had inherent virtues which were vitally needed for maintaining the country's unity and

continuity in administration. Thus the arduous tasks of nation-building and progress were entrusted to the newly created Indian Administrative Service (the IAS) successors to the ICS, but with no radical changes in the British administrative traditions.

The civil services in India are divided into three categories : all India services, central services and state services. The Constitution specifies two all India services, the Indian Administrative Service and the Indian Police Service, but additional all India services can be created by the Parliament, provided there is approval by two-thirds of the members of the Rajya Sabha. After independence three new all India services were created—engineeing, health and forestry. The recruitment to all India services is by competitive examinations organised by the Union Public Service Commission, the officers of which are later assigned to state cadres. Though serving in the states they remain under the payroll and disciplinary control of the Central Government and may come to New Delhi for short-term assignments under the Central Government.

The Central government services numbering more than twenty, include the Indian Foreign Service, the Central Secretariat Service, the Indian Postal Service and the Indian Revenue Service, the personnel for these are recruited on the basis of a common competitive examination. Each service has its own grades, pay scales, promotional avenues and distinct operational sphere and orientation. Personnel for the state services are recruited by the State Public Service Commissions. Structurally they do not differ much from the other two services, the only difference being that their personnel are subject to state control and are normally not transferred outside the state. Another structural characteristic of the Indian system of public administration is the rapid increase in the number of civil servants and its increasing structural diversification by the recruitment of more and more specialists and technocrats in the public service. Numerous reasons have been put forward for the rapid growth of the bureaucracy in India —the primary being that in a developing nation much needs to be done and there is usually no shortage of employable manpower. Hence to relieve the pressure of unemployment and meet increasing public demands for more government involvement the size of the bureaucracy goes on expanding. In India, the number of the Central Government employees stood at 1445,050, on April 1, 1948; it had gone upto 1,773,870 on June 30, 1957; by January 1971, it had risen to 29,82 lakh; and in 1980, the number of Central Government employees stood approximately at 3.6 million. The state and municipal public services have also shown significant growth in the last three decades.

The change in the character of the government and its ever expanding functions has been accompanied by an increasing

diversification in the composition of the public services everywhere leading to the recruitment of a growing number of specialists and technicians in government services. In India public services are increasingly employing more and more specialists like scientists, doctors, engineers, agronomists, economists, statisticians, educationists and jurists. According to the Third Central Pay Commission Report, 1973, the technical and professional services group of officials constituted 6.4 per cent of the total number of Central Government employees.

The Union Public Service Commission is responsible for all matters relating to the recruitment, appointment, transfers, promotion and disciplinary control of Central Government public service personnel.

The Socio-Economic Background

The IAS, constituted after independence on the model of the ICS, continues to have an elitist character by background and training of its members. This is evident from the many empirical studies on the socio-economic background of the Indian bureaucracy undertaken by various scholars—C.P. Bhambhri, V. Subramaniam, and R.K. Trivedi.[1] These studies have revealed that the Civil Services in India are still manned by persons belonging to the urban educated professional middle class of India. Civil service as a career seems to attract the youth from educated middle class more than from any other social sector. A higher proportion of young recruits come from the English medium convent schools and the more well known colleges. Consequently, the higher echelons of bureaucracy genereally belong to the educated upper middle classes of the urban areas or higher castes of rural areas. Their parents come from the upper strata of society and are engaged in the professions such as law, engineering, medicine and teaching. This fact is quite often reflected in their attitude to life, career, and the public in general. C.P. Bhambhri has observed that in the Indian context there is a dissonance between the orientation and attitudes of the higher civil service and the national goals of planning, equality, secularism, social justice and democracy.[2]

Children from business backgrounds, lower income groups and rural farming or artisan classes are grossly unrepresented in these services. In recent years, however, the social base of the services in India has considerably widened for the following reasons:

1. For a summary of their views see G.B. Sharma, "Social Composition of Indian Bureaucracy. Some Reflections on Its Representativeness", in Ramesh K. Arora, (ed.) *Indian Administrative System,* New Delhi, 1978, pp. 200-223.

2. C.P. Bhambhri, "The Administrative Elite and Political Modernization in India," *I. J.P.A.* 17 (1971), pp. 47-64.

(a) steady expansion of educational facilities and increase in
     the number of scholarships and freeships for economically
     needy students;

(b) reservation quota for scheduled castes and tribes; and

(c) lowering of marks for the interview to these services.

Despite these reasons, the Indian bureaucracy remains as un-
representative as ever, the higher civil services being drawn from
only ten per cent of the community. The attitude of the bureau-
crats reflects the bias and prejudice of their social class. Behaviour-
ally the bureaucrats continue to remain conservative and resistant
to change with an obsession for rules and regulations and routine
administration. They lack initiative, dynamism, and a will to change
their attitudes or orientation. In recent years, the reservation
policy has enabled many members of the lower castes to get into
the civil service. However, it has been observed that even among
them, it is the relatively better off sections, who avail of the reserva-
tion policy, and after joining the bureaucracy soon become a part
of the privileged classes like their other upper caste brethren. Hence,
in the long run, they are behaviourally no different from the rest.

Some scholars have however maintained that it is difficult to
say conclusively whether there is any direct correlation between
the socio-economic status of the services and their orientation.
The earlier theory that civil servants are sympathetic only to their
class of origin has not been proved without doubt. Many empirical
studies have proved that the socio-political attitudes of the
bureaucracy in general are not very different from the rest of the
society.

Indian Bureaucracy and Development Administration

Since independence India has attempted to follow a planned
system of development with the public administration as one of the
key instruments for spearheading the developmental efforts. India
is perhaps the only Third World country to experiment in planned
development through democratic means. The Government sought
to achieve growth with justice through a developmental model
which, as Jagannadham opines, reflects the combined influence of
the idealism of the freedom struggle, the democratic liberalism of
the West and the socialism of the Soviet Union.[3] Needless to say,
the Indian model is both unique and difficult to achieve. In advanc-
ed western countries economic development and growth was
preceded by political and administrative development. They took
years to reach the present level of prosperity and growth which we
tried to achieve in the shortest possible time span through peaceful

---

3. V. Jagannadham, "Citizen-Administration Relationships in Development"
    in V.A. Pai Panandikar, (ed.), *Development Administration in India*,
    Macmillan, Madras, 1974, p. 196.

means which precludes the use of force or other totalitarian methods. In Third World countries like ours, mere economic growth means nothing without relative equality. India's development plans were ambitious efforts meant to remove poverty, illiteracy, unemployment and disease. All public policies and governmental efforts were geared to the tasks of achieving developmental goals. Planned development was meant to bring about the most rational use of existing resources to create a developmental infrastructure in the industrial and agricultural spheres, urban and rural areas, and the benefits of development were sought to be as widely distributed as possible. Commenting on the changing role of the administrator today, T.N. Chaturvedi, a senior civil servant comments thus :

> It is an instrument for implementation of people's will and aspirations as expressed in the Constitution. It is the focal point of stability and order in the shifting sands of politics. At the same time, as an elitist class, it is an instrument of modernization and social change. It is an instrument of planning and economic development. It may be expected to safeguard the rights of the underprivileged sections in society. It has to be all the time aware of the political milieu and the democratic context in which it has to operate. Therefore, the civil service has to undergo radical structural, procedural and attitudinal changes if it has to serve as an effective instrument of change and progress in a developing society. The civil service has to cultivate much wider social awareness and responsiveness as well as social base apart from the traditional virtues of integrity, functional efficiency and a sense of fair play and impartiality.[5]

The Indian bureaucracy suffers from numerous dysfunctional constraints. Firstly, as discussed earlier, our bureaucratic culture is still dominated by the colonial ethos which is greatly dysfunctional from the point of required value-patterns for development administration. The Indian bureaucracy is still authoritarian, unresponsive and paternalistic in its public dealings to a great extent. Secondly, it displays all the demerits of the Weberian model, by its recurrent tendencies towards delay, rigidity and obsession with rules and regulations, at the cost of performance. It lacks dynamism and initiative and is best suited for routine jobs. Development administration has to be result-oriented, dynamic and flexible in approach. Thirdly, the socio-economic background of the majority of bureaucrats makes them conservative and rigid. They gradually become incapable either by interest or habit, of feeling the pulse of the people. They learn to put a high premium on conformity and propriety, and observance of precedents. In

---

4. T.N. Chaturvedi, "Forward" in A.R. Tyagi, (ed.), *The Civil Service in a Developing Society*, Delhi, 1960.

short, caution rather than change is their outlook on work. They hardly make any efforts at soliciting public cooperation and participation in administrative affairs, or establishing rapport with the citizens and community to understand their problems, demands and desires. Other dysfunctions which the bureaucracy is subject to, are impersonality, the tendency to stress organisational procedures rather than performance, lack of originality and initiative. A rigid hierarchical structure precludes team spirit and mutual trust. The power and privileges of the higher levels of the bureaucracy have only strengthened their class consciousness and elitist character.

A study undertaken by Ralph Braibanti and his associates[5] clearly displayed that British values continued to set the tone of bureaucracy in India, and there has been no radical departure from the pre-independence norms which included obsequiousness towards superiors and an ostrich-like attitude to changing conditions.

In a study on the impact of cultural environment and the prevalent value systems in a society on bureaucratic behaviour Higginbotham[6] has analysed the behavioural patterns of the Indian bureaucracy in a setting characterized by conflicting and changing cultural patterns. The Indian bureaucrats, many of whom were raised in traditional Hindu environment, as they carry out their duties in formal bureaucratic structures, are strongly reminiscent of the pre-independence British administration. They reveal ambivalence and contradiction in values which are the result of the twin processes of traditionalism and modernity.

The Indian bureaucracy also suffers from certain strange paradoxes like extreme impersonality combined with ready susceptibility to personal pressures and corruption. Administrative corruption may take many forms in India. It may be nepotism and favouritism in the process of selection, recruitment or promotions in public services and taking bribes and doing illegal favours in a variety of ways. One of the reasons for its widespread increase is red-tapism and delay in administrative functioning.

In a recent study of the Indian bureaucracy and its compatibility with development administration, Pai Panandikar and Kshirsagar observe that the bureaucratic structure and its orientation to a development role are not necessarily incompatible. However, bureaucratic behaviour generally adversely influences development orientation. The bureaucracy in India will not be able to accomplish the developmental programmes as long as it retains its present

5.   Ralph Braibanti and Joseph J. Spengler (eds.), *Administration and Economic Development in India*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1963.
6.   Stanley J. Higginbotham, *Cultures in Conflict, The Four Faces of Indian Bureaucracy*, New York, 1975.

character, although such a bureaucracy could yet be utilised in certain specified sectors of structural transformation such as improvement of roads, irrigation and public sector enterprises[7].

The failure of the Indian bureaucracy has been most prominent wherever nation-building programmes required a new value-orientation or a modified institutional framework.

Generally, the bureaucracy in India has resisted innovations in its structural arrangements and it has been firm in its faith in the superiority of the pyramidal structure of administration, in its resentment of the efforts to remodel the administration for nation building purposes, and its adherence to the numerous administrative routines which practically immobilise developmental administration. The bureaucracy's lack of adequate understanding of the culture and value in India and lack of a balanced assessment of its past and future roles have been important factors in the failure of its effective utilisation in the programmes of planned socio-economic change.[8]

Bureaucracy and Politics

Though it is proved that the bureaucracy in India still retains a continuity with pre-independence traditions after independence, it has had to operate in an environment which is qualitatively different from the earlier period. It has now to function under elected political leaders and operate within a democratic framework of responsible cabinets, questioning legislatures, prying political parties and highly demanding pressure groups. It has to be responsive to public policies laid down by the political executive and legislatures, the objectives of the leadership and the demands and wishes of the ordinary public. The three implications of this new dimension are reflected in[9]

(a) the minister-civil servant relationship;

(b) increasing politicisation of the bureaucracy; and

(c) growing exposure of the public official to public attention, scrutiny and control. The present pattern of relationship between the ministers and the civil servants in our country is based on constitutional provisions and conventions regarding the working of the parliamentary form of government, namely, the obligation of ministers as well as government officials to uphold the Constitution and the

7. V.A. Pai Panandikar and S.S. Kshirsagar, *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, New Delhi, 1978.
8. Dvivedi and Jain, *India's Administrative State*, 1985, p. 226.
9. See A. Avasthi, "Role of Public Service in Development", in A. Avasthi and Ramesh K. Arora (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Development : Indian Perspectives*, Associated, New Delhi, pp. 1-12.

rule of law; the obligation of every public servant to implement faithfully all policies and decisions of ministers even if these be contrary to the advice tendered by him; and the freedom of public servants to express themselves fearlessly in tendering advice to their superiors including ministers.

In practice however, the civil servant-minister relationship is quite delicate and has been the cause of considerable strain and mutual heart burning in recent years. In the discharge of their respective duties differences of opinion often lead to prickly relations. Sometimes the civil servant may attempt to do a thing in a way the minister does not approve of, at other times the civil servant's obligation to observe rules of procedure and strict neutrality might prove irksome to the minister. On the other hand, the civil servant may blame the minister as undue interference in his work. Free and frank advice by a subordinate official often proves to be inconvenient and unflattering to the minister who may start resenting his subordinate's advice. This has led to a tendency on the part of an increasing number of civil servants to attempt to anticipate the minister's wishes, and proffer their advice accordingly. A further development of this unhealthy trend is the emergence of personal affiliations leading to an element of politicization among the civil servants.

According to British parliamentary traditions the responsibility of the minister to the legislature demands that for every act or neglect of his department, the minister must answer and the official must be protected from legislative attack. The traditional concept of the civil servant in a parliamentary democracy has been that of the anonymous servant of his minister bound by constitutional convention to make his experience, judgment and departmental knowledge confidentially available to his political master, no matter what party is in office, and to accept and put into effect the minister's decisions. The essential features of the concept of civil service neutrality stemming from this are:

(1) Public confidence in the freedom of the civil service from all political bias.

(2) Ministers' confidence in obtaining loyal service from the civil service irrespective of what political party is in power.

(3) High staff morale based on confidence that promotions and other rewards do not depend upon political origins or partisan activity but on merit alone.

These aspects of the traditional concept have been challenged of late. The role of the senior civil servants is not only confined to giving policy advice to the persons above them but increasingly they are assuming a managerial role for implementing development programmes. Secondly, the administrator is no longer anonymous.

He also participates in the policy making process and is sometimes required to defend in public the decisions which the minister has taken, because of the unhealthy tendency of the minister to make the official the scapegoat for all acts of omission and commission in his charge. Thirdly, as indicated by Appleby, administration has acquired a political dimension as it must be responsive to public opinion and public welfare and interest.

Lastly, democracy has influenced the administration in diverse ways. Public administration is one of the vital elements of a popularly elected government. A public official today, in the present set-up, cannot mechanically implement development programmes. He has to take initiative, explain the objectives of government policies to the people, and seek popular support and enthusiasm in their implementation. He has to be both responsive to and responsible for public needs and aspirations. The civil service now has to work not only under political direction but also under the obligation of political accountability.

Another aspect of carrying on administration within a democratic framework has been that the pressure on administration has increased alarmingly. Public expectations have increased rapidly, the people have become more conscious and increasingly vocal of their rights and needs. The pressure to show results has gone up which has led to a power struggle between the elected representatives and the bureaucrats for taking major political decisions relating to development administration. The bureaucrats claim the sole authority to determine and administer governmental programmes while politicians insist that being the people's representatives, they alone have the right to know what benefits the people most. Political interference in matters of appointment, promotion and transfer have adversely affected the morale of the public officials.

In the changed environment, therefore, it is not enough for a civil servant to be efficient, competent, remain anonymous and neutral to perform the multiple tasks he is being called upon to perform in India today. In the context of development administration, if the government is to deliver the goods, the civil servant must be something more than a mere executor of policy. He must be a specialist and a professional committed to the national goals of progress and development. The needs of contemporary Indian society and people's aspirations demand that the civil servants have to be equipped to handle the political, social, economic and scientific problems of our time. They will be increasingly called upon to keep pace with the rapid change in knowledge and technology and acquire new techniques to apply it. Thus the norm of having generalist administrators have come to be severely questioned. It has been stated that the civil service is no place for the amateur. It must be staffed by men and women who are professional in their outlook and training and well equipped for the tasks they have to perform.

In the second place, a civil service, which is neutral, will tend to be callous and indifferent; unresponsive and unsympathetic to the impact of its actions on the people. Development administration requires committed public officials who possess a sense of emotional integration with the policies and programmes and identification with the interests of the common man. It has been argued that the traditional concept of anonymity and neutrality of the civil servant is irrelevant in the present context. Emotional neutrality towards work or indifference to the objects of management is a concept of dubious validity which is neither possible nor desirable. A certain amount of dedicated involvement in the goals of service is required and is the first criteria of successful administration. What is to be avoided is partisan politics. A "commitment" to social welfare goals of public service has to be consciously cultivated among the career civil servants.[10]

The basic problem of Indian development is how to utilize new sources of initiative and loyalty and to evolve new patterns of organization and action. Systematic transformation of Indian society requires both political and administrative modernization and constitutes critically interrelated processes. The basic problem is to strike an appropriate relationship between representative institutions and the implementation of public policy. Democracy requires political control of the bureaucracy, but the reins should not be so tight as to make the bureaucracy demoralised, and completely dysfunctional to development. The responsibility for gearing the bureaucracy to the tasks of development and providing adequate political direction remains in the hands of the political leadership.

The Soviet Model of Administration

A constitution for the new Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) was first adopted in January 1924, and later superseded by the constitution of 1936, which defines the USSR as a 'Socialist state of workers and peasants.' It has been revised several times since. Soviet Russia thus came to be divided into fifteen Union Republics of which the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic (RSFSR) maintains its prominence. There are also several autonomous Republics and autonomous Regions falling within this major division. Besides the Federal Government, there are complete systems of local government, regions, districts, towns and rural areas, forming a hierarchy of governmental institutions, deriving power from a perallel system of local soviets.

At the apex of the federal system is the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which exercises both legislative and certain other state

10. See S.P. Singh, "Civil Service Commitment and Socio-economic Development", in *ibid.*, pp. 40-45.

powers not specifically assigned to other branches. It is a two-chamber body comprising a Council of Nationalities and a Council of the Union, both elected, the first on a nationalities basis and the second on a population basis. But the Supreme Soviet which meets only for short periods annually, elects a Presidium consisting of a Chairman, fifteen Deputy Chairmen (one for each Union Republic), a Secretary and twenty-one members to act for it between sessions. The Presidium is in effect the government of the USSR, with high political and diplomatic responsibilities and numerous specific functions of a legislative and executive nature, including interpretation of existing laws. On the recommendation of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, it appoints the Ministers of the USSR and other high offices of State, subject to subsequent confirmation by the Supreme Soviet. The actual administration is placed in the hands of the Council of Ministers, which is described below.

The Union Council of Ministers consists of a Chairman, a Vice-Chairman, Ministers of the USSR and Chairmen of State Committees. There are about one hundred members of the Council of Ministers. The Chairmen of the Council of Ministers of the Union Republics are ex-officio members of the Union Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers is the supreme executive organ of the state in the USSR. It is responsible and accountable to the Supreme Soviet or to the Presidium. The main task of the Council is the execution of laws and their operation throughout the Union.

All Union Republics have a parallel structure with a Supreme Soviet, a Presidium and a Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers is the supreme executive and administrative organ of each Union Republic. Local Soviets are organs of state power who have the authority to act independently on matters that come within their scope in their local administrative divisions ranging from a territory to a rural community. Local Soviets are elected for a term of two and a half years by the members of a given area. They are responsible for the direction of economic, social and cultural life of the people in their area of jurisdiction and to ensure the compliance of laws.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) is the highest social and political organization in the USSR. The CPSU provides ideological and political guidelines to the Soviet people. Primary party cells are found in all industrial enterprises, collective and state farms and in various government institutions. They ensure that party members are directly connected with the working of all spheres of Soviet society. The supreme organ of the party is its Congress. Its meeting takes place once in every five years. In between its sessions, the Central Committee performs all the activities of the party. The Party Congress elects members of the

Central Committee. The Party Politbureau which guides Party activities in between the sessions of the Central Committee is elected by the Central Committee. The decisions taken by the Politbureau are implemented by all other organs of the party. The policies worked out by the Party serve as guidelines for the Soviet Government.

The Soviet Administration

At the top of the pyramid stands the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, exercising supreme policy making and co-ordinating responsibilities. Just below it are the All Union and Union-Republic ministries which make up the Council of Ministers; besides a substantial number of committees, commissions, councils, and agencies attached to the Council of Ministers.

The typical all-union ministry covers one or the other branch of heavy industry such as automobiles, road building machinery or fuel. To carry out its responsibilities, the ministry is divided into many departments, organised on what is called the territorial production principle. This means that responsibilities of a particular department are limited not only to enterprises carrying on a particular type of activity but also to those enterprises which cover a specific area. Several departments, for example, deal with oil refining, each in a different part of the country. Each department has powers to deal with the enterprises, like factories and mines, in its field and area. It controls their supply of raw materials, sale of goods and gives advice on technical and financial questions.

The Union Republic ministries are concerned with sectors jointly directed by the USSR and the Union Republics, such as agriculture, education, culture, trade, communication, coal mining and finance.

There are two major distinctions between the All-Union and Union Republic ministries. The pattern of organization in the Union Republic ministries is less centralized. The All-Union ministries operate with a field organization directly responsible to the centre, the Union Republic ministries work in the field through counterpart ministries in each of the fifteen republics which compose the USSR. These counterpart ministries supervise all the enterprises or administrative subdivisions of the ministry which are located in that republic.

Secondly, the All-Union ministry is responsible only to the Central Government. The counterpart ministries in the republics are responsible to the Council of Ministers on the one hand and legislative organs of their own republics on the other.

Each republic of the USSR has its own Council of Ministers. The Council is made up of two types of ministries—the union

republic ministries, and the republican ministries which vary in number from republic to republic. Below the level of the republic there are at least three subordinate levels of administration in the Soviet Union; the autonomous republican oblasts or Krais, which may be treated as regional administrative units, the raions or district units, and the towns and villages, which may be described as local units. The urban areas operate under a separate system. The largest cities are directly subordinate to the republics and are themselves broken up into districts. The cities of moderate size report to the oblasts, while the smaller towns are subordinate to the raion governments.

At each level of this hierarchy, there are various administrative departments which are responsible both to the executive committee of the Soviet elected at that level, and to the administrators exercising corresponding functions at the next higher level. In the event of a conflict arising out of such double supervision, the higher soviet organs are vested with the right to resolve the dispute.

The structure of the Soviet public administration is built around differential treatment of various types of administrative functions and activities. In the case of the All-Union heavy industry ministries, the pattern is one of extreme centralization, with the field organization responsible directly to Moscow. In the Union Republic ministries, policy control is centralised, but some administrative decentralization is achieved by utilizing the rebublic and its subordinate levels of government as instruments of supervision. Where administrative activities are of diversified local significance, the point of policy control is the republic, with operational responsibilities lodged at the regional, district and local levels. At each level of government, administrative action is theoretically subject to check by soviets which are popularly elected at that level. Such checks are described by the Soviet scholars as infusing elements of mass participation and control into the administrative process.

Recruitment of administrative and technical personnel is the responsibility of the various ministries and agencies. Every sector of industry and administration has its parallel system of advanced schools and institutes which feed their graduates into the branch of public administration for which they prepare. Annual admission quotas are set for each school. Students who are accepted and who graduate with a satisfactory record are referred to an appropriate government agency or enterprise for assignment to a job.

Officials in the Soviet executive are not recruited by formal civil service procedures such as competitive examinations, nor are they guaranteed job tenure. Yet informally, civil service principles seem to have permeated the administrative system. Top ministerial officials, as well as junior personnel, generally are the products of the hierarchy in which they are employed. Their career patterns

usually have the specialized orderly nature that suggests promotion on the basis of performance rather than political criterion.

Notable Features and Trends

Since the nature and working of every scheme of administration is largely determined by the peculiarities of a country's socio-economic milieu and its political culture, public administration in the Soviet Union is understandably different in its nature and scope from that of western constitutional democracies.

The nature of the state bureaucracy and the scope of the demands made upon it reflect the needs of the Soviet system as developed in Russia since the 1917 revolution. The system aims at monolithic unity under the guidance of the Communist Party. Soviet Administration is one-party administration with its ideological context. Every field of administration is regarded as a channel for the propagation of the party policies under the direction of the top leadership. Soviet public administration exhibits features which sharply differentiate it from the administrative systems of other western democracies. It is all pervasive in character. It seeks to organize and regulate the complete range of human activities in the Soviet society. Every field of the economy and every type of social expression from art, music and culture to sports and entertainment are subject to administrative regulation and control. The socialist system requires a nation of disciplined public servants trained for serving the public interest. To convey an idea of the scope of government activities in the USSR, the following may be listed which though by no means extensive, give an idea of the range of government tasks :

(a) The government maintains public order. It maintains courts and law enforcement agencies for the purpose of adjudicating conflicts and executing legal decisions.

(b) The government conducts foreign relations with foreign states, maintains a military establishment and by other means prepares for the defence of the country.

(c) The government maintains the educational system. All educational facilities from nurseries to the highest post-graduate institutions are created and operated by the government. Their curricula are worked out by the state administrators and their personnel are public officials.

(d) All scientific work in the USSR is organized, planned, sponsored and supported by the government, whereas in other societies, this kind of activity is distributed among various public authorities, private institutions of learning, and business corporations.

(e) Virtually all health care, insurance, and social security

activities in the Soviet Union are carried out by agencies of the government. Hence physicians and all other medical personnel are public officials too, as are lawyers and social workers.

(f) Art and entertainment are organized by the government either directly or indirectly under its control. For instance, sports clubs, theatres, film industry, radio, television and publishing houses are government controlled.

(g) The economy of the Soviet Union has been almost completely nationalized. Virtually all enterprises are public enterprises, owned and operated by the government including all industry and communications and most of the distribution system, with the exemption of some retailing of agricultural produce.

Thus the scope of government activities in the USSR seems truly all encompassing. Figures on the size and number of government employees seem irrelevant in this connection. In a society where all organized activity is managed by the government, almost everyone becomes a civil servant, and the state the only employer. The notion of "bureaucracy" however, will be restricted here to include only the supervisory, managerial or administrative personnel—the overhead staff.

Lenin developed the basic principles of administration of socialist society—the principle of *democratic centralism* whereby systematic centralised control is combined with broad democracy and local initiatives by foremost bodies of workers ; the principles of *objectivity* and *concreteness*, which require that the system of control should take into account the objective laws and their specific manifestations in concrete historical conditions; the principle of *effectiveness* and *optimisation*, under which maximum results must be obtained at a minimum expenditure of materials, labour and money ; the principle of *stimulation*, which is to ensure the combination of the material and moral stimuli to work; the principle of the *main bulk* or singling out from a great number of tasks that which provides the key to the entire complex of administrative problems : the *territory-and-branch* principle of combining administrative, territorial and industrial branch approach ; the principle of combining *the official*[11] *and social* principles of administration. Lenin insisted on every administrative worker being judged (a) from the point of view of his conscientiousness, (b) from the political angle, (c) in the light of his knowledge of his job, and (d) by his administrative ability.

Lenin stressed more than once that neither age, nor past

11. For a detailed discussion of their principles see V.G. Afana Syev, *The Scientific Management of Society*, Progress, Moscow, chapter 7.

services, high rank or influential connections were adequate criteria for promotion to administrative posts but "loyalty to socialism" combined with "a sober and practical mind," adequate scientific and technical knowledge, talent for organisation, and ability to get a large number of people to work together were to be taken into account. He believed that only such people should be promoted to responsible posts as directors of the people's labour, or directors of administration. A manager of administration or industry must be not only "ideologically firm, politically mature and highly responsible", he must also be familiar with the science of management and able to pursue his activities in keeping with its principles. The measures taken by the Communist Party clear the way for development of a new business-like style of management free from narrow technicalism and administration, and of a new type of managers with a broad social approach to administering.

In theory, the Soviet political system is a combination of democracy and centralism. Democracy is seen here as the power of the Soviet working people, election of governing bodies at all levels, and above all, their accountability to various institutional units of the political system as well as to the main source of power, the people. On the other side, centralism is conceived as a collective leadership exercised on the principles of subordination of minority to the majority, undivided authority, and above all, obedience and discipline. Democracy and centralism are claimed to be inter-linked, indeed integrated in the Soviet political system. It means, in brief, expressing different views, ascertaining majority opinion incorporating in it a decision, and conscientiously implementing that decision.

Initially, the Communist revolutionaries were confronted with the dilemma of all communist countries that of reconciling the expectations of Marxist thought with the fact of governing through an administrative machinery inherited from pre-revolutionary Russia. "The withering away of the State" was a concept that anticipated a time when no police, no courts, no army, or force of any kind would be necessary to restrain the people. There would remain only the administrators who might be even ordinary citizens. Certainly the Bolsheviks came to power determined to do away with the bureaucratic apparatus of the old regime.

However to meet the immediate needs for survival and to assume the burden of industrial development, it became gradually apparent that the existing bureaucracy could not be eliminated entirely but would have to be revamped to suit the needs of the regime. The strategy adopted was to utilize the old bureaucrats as long as this could not be avoided, while surrounding them with controls and to train a new generation of soviet-administrators as soon as possible.

The system of administration that developed during the late 1920's and 1930's was highly centralized and increasingly staffed with products of the massive Soviet educational programme of post-revolutionary Russia. The new Soviet technical and administrative personnel became more and more important to the Party leadership and large numbers were recruited into the Party during the middle and late 1930's until its social composition was changed. Of great importance for the policy process in the Soviet Union is the fact that scientific and technical personnel constitute a significant part of the staff of administrative and technical organisations in the USSR. This is due to the fact that administration of economic enterprises constitutes a sizeable part of the administrative work in the Soviet Union. Most of the All Union ministries are economic ministries dealing with the administration of heavy industries. Since the energies of the Soviet Union are concentrated to such a vast extent upon industrial production, it is hardly surprising that the majority of outstanding public servants in the country are the industrial managers. As a result there is much less difficulty in moving from the position of a manager of an enterprise to an important position in a ministry than would be the case in western countries. Former factory managers now occupy many of the highest administrative posts both in the Soviet government and in the Communist Party. Since the government directs industry, both government and industrial posts require much of the same qualifications—technical knowledge of industry, efficiency in handling work and people, and a strong commitment to the goals of the Party and the State.

Control of the public administration is the primary means through which the Communist Party has established and maintained its power. It is intimately involved in administration and ultimately dependent on the bureaucracy to preserve its political control, though the government and the party machinery are theoretically different. Party control is ensured through a network of interlocking directorates at each hierarchical level of both the party and the bureaucratic apparatus. The Party has its units in every major organization in the Soviet society. Day to day operating responsibilities are vested in the governmental hierarchy of managers and administrators. But every level of the governmental hierarchy is both interpenetrated with and subject to check by the corresponding level of the Party hierarchy.

The Communist Party in the USSR has developed a variety of devices to make its control operative throughout the bureaucratic structure. There is an attractive system of incentives, bonuses and rewards for production in excess of plan. It combines positive incentives with negative controls which impose harsh penalties for failure. Positive incentives to higher productivity are provided by differential wage payments carefully graded to reflect and stimulate increased work output on the part of individual workers. A system

of supplementary incentives in the form of bonuses, prizes, orders and models is utilised to recognize outstanding work. Appeals are made to emulate instincts by organizing campaigns of "socialist competition" among enterprises and individual workers. Through exhortation and indoctrination, the party leadership attempts to persuade both officials and workers to identify their interests with state interests. Thus the main aim of Soviet personnel policy is to increase output through every possible means—like compulsion, incentives and exhortation to stimulate administrative efficiency and inculcate loyalty to the socialist system.[12]

Comparison Between the Weberian Model and the Soviet Bureaucracy

Evidently one attribute of all bureaucratic organisations is the implementation of policies through an administrative staff. No discussion on conception of a bureaucratic organisation can proceed without reference to the Weberian model of bureaucracy. The basic structural prerequisites of the Weberian model are:

(i) defined rights and duties prescribed in written regulations;
(ii) systematically ordered authority relationships;
(iii) promotions regulated by merit and seniority;
(iv) technical competence as a formal condition of employment;
(v) fixed monetary salaries;
(vi) strict separation of the office and the incumbent in the sense that the employee does not own the means of administration and cannot appropriate the position;
(vii) administrative work as a full time career; and
(viii) operations governed by a system of abstract rules and their consistent application to particular cases.

The Soviet conception of bureaucracy has been influenced by the Marxist theory of state as defined and adapted by the Soviet ideologues. There are three basic elements in the Marxist perception of the state. Firstly, state is an organ of class domination. Second, it exists to create an order which legalises and perpetuates the oppression of one class by moderating class conflicts. Thirdly, state is a temporary phenomenon, it will wither away with the abolition of classes. In advocating the abolition of the state, however, the Marxist theory does not rule out the imperative of having an administrative machinery in a society. It contends that unlike the capitalist society, in a communist society agencies of

12. Merle Fainsod, *How Russia is Ruled*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1953, Chapter XII.

administration will be organised on the principle of representation and their functioning will be conditioned by social division of labour. In this context the function of administration primarily relates to the management of the level and the varied modes of production in the light of the social priorities at a given point of time. In other words, it ceases to remain merely an instrument of coercion and becomes responsible to society.

Evidently the Western and Soviet conceptions of bureaucracy differ regarding its specific functions and role.[13] Weber views bureaucratic organisation in a value-neutral context; it stands for rationality and machine-like efficiency. In Marxist-Leninist conception it is an organ of political coercion in a class society. Weber underlines the continuity and permanence of bureaucracy and considers it an indispensable machinery for managing a complex industrial society. In the Soviet viewpoint, the old bureaucratic model needs to be replaced by a new one based on the elective principle and accountability to the public. These differences apart, the Soviet theory emphasizes the continuance of administration (though on a social basis) even after the so-called withering away of the Soviet State. Theoretically, it denotes the management of multiple public tasks on specific functional basis without the impingement of the coercive political role of the state.

However theory apart, bureaucratic organisations, whether in the West or in the Soviet Union, perform some important common functions. Some of the common structural features of the Soviet public bureaucracies are : hierarchical structure, use of rules and regulations, impersonality of operations, division of labour, complexity of administrative tasks, and employment of trained personnel either on a career or programme basis.

In analysing the Soviet and western bureaucracies it has been further demonstrated by various scholars that formal attributes by themselves do not ensure the operational efficiency of a bureaucratic organisation. Despite the common view of the Soviet bureaucratic system as a huge monolithic structure, it has been noted by various experts that Soviet bureaucratic organisations like their western counterparts have been seen to develop pluralism and informal interaction patterns.

Finally, like the big corporations or the governmental agencies in the USA or UK, the Soviet organisations also suffer from the weaknesses of what a scholar has called "bureaupathic" behaviour that creates bottlenecks in their operations. This is due to the "perennial problem of insecurity that results from imbalance

13. Shivaji Ganguly, "A Comparative Paradigm of Western and Soviet Bureaucracies", *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXIII, 1977, pp. 100-113.

between the hierarchical authority and specialised ability."[14] These dysfunctional tendencies may be considerably reduced either by periodic structural adjustments for improved co-ordination or by the control imposed by certain external agencies to which the bureaucratic organisations remain accountable. In the West, governmental agencies are not only responsible to the legislative bodies but also are mutually counterpoised. In the Soviet Union though the bureaucratic organisations are theoretically responsible to the party, they are also answerable to a host of other organs like the legal apparatus, the planning agencies and the political agencies.

In the Soviet Union, the organisational structure as well as the process of decision-making, either at the level of the state organs or the party apparatus, are guided by the principles of democratic centralism, dual subordination, and production-territorial criterion. The term democratic centralism[15] denotes the permissibility of dissent or debate to the extent that it does not jeopardise organisational unity of action already agreed upon. Besides, it also calls for absolutely binding character of decisions of higher bodies on lower bodies. The principle of dual subordination makes each administrative unit responsible to the popular assembly which apparently created it, and vertically, to the corresponding organ at the next level in the hierarchical chain. The production territorial principle assumes that within a particular geographical area, all enterprises engaged in a given line of production would be co-ordinated within one administrative hierarchy.

Generally, operative methods of the Soviet administrative apparatus are based on the concepts of "one-man-management" and collegiate management.[16] Theoretically these two concepts stand for two different forms of organisation within the Soviet system—board governed or individually managed agencies. In practice, however, both the principles are involved in the operation of all Soviet agencies, irrespective of their cited form. If the principle of collegiate management seeks to ensure collective leadership in making of decisions regarding vital problems, "one-man management principle" has been so conceived as to inhibit shirking of individual responsibility by entrusting a precise task to any one in charge of an agency or a bureau. The method of recruitment in the Soviet Union is exceptionally centralised and is also an extremely political-civil system. It operates through what is known as the 'Nomenklatura'—a comprehensive set of job categories and descriptions, defined as a list of posts confirmed by superior

14.   John N. Hazard, *The Soviet System of Government*, University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 219-257.

15.   *ibid.*

16.   David Granick, *The Red Executive, A Study of the Organisation Man in Russian Industry*, London, Macmillan, 1960.

organisations.[17] It is administered in accordance with their status, by the Party and the government. This system seeks to ensure standardization of selection norms, tenure of office, and promotion based on competence and ideological commitment. Inclusion in the nomenklatura list is not determined by any test, but by the recognition of one's efficiency and merit in a particular field or profession.

Some Models of Soviet Administration

The best way to assess the viability of any administrative system, particularly the Soviet, is its ability or inability to effectively cater to the needs of the Soviet people through well formulated policies. For any realistic assessment of the Soviet administrative system, it is important to realise that the Soviet Union is a modern industrial society. which contrary to the image of monolithic unity that it still officially professes. has in reality different notions of societal needs viewed differently by different social groups, which would make it similar in many ways to other industrial societies. In the USSR, the official policymaker is the Communist Party, which defines the needs of Soviet society in all major spheres like social services, industrial production and medical care; announcing goals and their methods of implementation. These goals provide a yardstick by which the level of performance of the Soviet administration can be measured by the Soviet public, and others as well.

Two major models of Soviet public policy making that have influenced scholars of administration for a long time have been the comprehensive decision making model and the incremental decision making model. In the first model, rationality and optimal solution are sought to be achieved by monocratic decision making in organisations. This model seeks maximisation of goals by rational decision making aimed at controlling all the elements necessary for the performance of its tasks. Where such control is impossible, the organisation attempts to predict or forecast changes in the work situation that affect the outcome of goals.

Ideologically, the comprehnsive model is consistent with the goals of Marxism Leninism, says Gordan Smith.[18] Marxist theory assumes that the trend of evolution of the future society is towards the ideal of communism. Similarly, the underlying assumption of the comprehensive model is that policies are formulated to reach optimal solutions, that is, an ideal end point. This model supports the Weberian view of administration that administration is an impersonal machine meant to carry out state objectives—a view

17.   Alfred G. Mayer, *The Soviet Political System*, Random House, New York, 1965, pp. 209-210.
18.   For a detailed discussion see Gordon Smith, *Public Policy and Administration in the Soviet Union*, Praeger, New York, 1980, pp. 1-14.

best typified in practice by the Soviet bureaucracy. In the Soviet Union, the influence of the comprehensive model is reflected in attempts at long range planning and centralised policy making.

Gordon Smith asserts that the second model of policy making which is called the incremental model exists in practice, if not in theory, in Soviet administration. Incrementalism holds that though it is not always possible to accurately predict policy consequences, in the long run it is wiser to go for serial decision making. The underlying assumption of this model is that of a pluralistic society with divergent social groups and interests which could best be governed by decentralised policy making or dispersal of decision making power.

This model of policy making is incompatible with official Soviet ideology which considers that the CPSU and its policies reflect the will and best interests of all sectors of Soviet society, thereby rendering all institutional factions illegitimate.

However, public policy in the USSR is often the result of a compromise between conflicting groups and institutions. There are numerous instances of ad hoc policy making, representing shifting influences of particular forces or interests, in Soviet society at a particular time. Hough views incrementalism as a "hallmark of the system" of Soviet decision making.

Pluralism in practice has led to reinforcing of centralised tendencies in policy making from time to time. Since 1970, the Soviet leadership has repeatedly stressed the need for structural and attitudinal change in organisation and administrative methods to meet the changing needs of a modern industrialised nation and increase the effectiveness of state bureaucracy.

> There has been a massive effort to transplant systems and administrative models applied so successfully in defence and space programmes into other areas in order to improve planning and management in Soviet economy and Soviet administration in general. This drive toward organisation design and application of technology is part of what is called scientific technical revolution. However, until the Kremlin leadership confronts and resolves the tension between the inherent pluralism in Soviet policy making which fosters incremental policy making, and its desire for centralised planning and control, which points toward comprehensive policy making, these efforts to streamline and rationalise the policy process in the Soviet Union will have only limited success.[19]

It is a fact that a great deal of decision making autonomy is enjoyed by lower levels of the administrative hierarchy in the USSR. According to the theory of democratic centralism, a decision is taken at the top levels by the administrative and political

19.   *ibid.*, p. 30.

elite only after considerable debate and discussion by officials at all levels lower down the ladder. Local officials may often alter and change original policies, both at the decision making stage and at the stage of implementation. Thus information and authority flow up as well as down the administrative hierarchy.

Most policies are framed in broad terms leaving room for changes or modification during implementation.

Pluralism in policy making in the USSR can be identified in terms of factions but has found wider expression in (bureaucratic) occupational or institutional conflicts. There are many reasons for this. First, policy conflicts in the Soviet Union tend to follow institutional lines, rather than voluntary interest groups or lobby organisations. In Soviet society the CPSU is the only legitimate political organisation said to represent all sectors of society. Hence other groups and factions with specific interests are not granted legitimacy in the political process.

Second, an institution in which a person is employed provides much more than employment and salary. It may also provide housing, medical care, schools, daycare centres besides access to certain other privileges and services. With the relative equality of income distribution in the USSR these extra benefits and privileges may greatly define status. There is, thus, a fusion of institutional and individual interests in the Soviet Union not found in the West. Since factionalism is officially not recognised nor allowed a place in the political process, group divisions or conflicting interests legitimise their position by articulating their views through occupational or bureaucratic groups which have a voice in decision making. Thus conflicts in the Soviet political system are often reflected in bureaucratic struggles for influence. Paul Cocks has written of dispersal of administrative authority to important bureaucratic sub-systems—the military, factory managers, regional party secretaries, agricultural interests, and jurists.[20] If important interests wish to influence decisions they have to be represented by a section of the bureaucracy. Most Soviet policies are the outcome of compromises and adjustments among these bureaucratic groups representing diverse interests in Soviet society.

Therefore, the bureaucracy in Soviet society is not mere carrier of orders of the CPSU, but influential, semi-autonomous participant in the policy making and implementing process.

China

The Chinese Communist Party (CCP), convened the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference on September 21, 1949, in

---

20. Paul Cocks, "The Policy Process and Bureaucratic Politics" in *The Dynamics of Soviet Politics*, Cambridge, Mass : Harvard University Press, 1976, p. 158.

Peking. The Conference adopted a 'Common Programme' of 60 Articles and the 'Organic Law of the Central People's Government' of 31 Articles. Both became the basis of the constitution adopted on September 20, 1954 by the First National People's Congress, the supreme legislative body.

The 1954 Constitution was both a political and an organizational document. It indicated the steps to be taken to build a 'Socialist' society, defined the structure and functions of government organs and the rights and duties of citizens appropriate in the period of transition to socialism.

In January 1975, the Fourth National People's Congress approved a constitution, under which China was defined as a 'socialist state of the dictatorship of the proletariat'. The 1975 Constitution was a simpler document than its predecessor, emphasizing the role of politics in society, especially the thoughts of Mao, but giving fewer organizational details. In March 1978, the Fifth National People's Congress adopted a new Constitution of 60 Articles which revived several of the provisions of the 1954 Constitution dropped in the 1975 document and eliminated much of the latter's innovatory radicalism.

Another Constitution was adopted in 1982. It defines 'socialist modernization' as China's basic task. Its most striking change is the restoration of the post of the Head of State.

Administrative Structure

The Chinese Communist regime represents a revolutionary movement, operating in a tradition rooted but changing society, that has attempted not only to create a new polity but also to use political power to achieve rapid modernization and to transform China's social structure and system of values. As such, it has evolved organizational structures and modes of operation that blend in a unique fashion elements from a variety of sources. "The theoretical Leninist model of 'democratic centralism,' the post-Leninist model of Soviet society, the Chinese Communists' own pre-1949 experience in conducting revolutionary struggle and administering 'liberated' areas, and not the least important China's centuries old traditions of authoritarianism, elitism, ideological orthodoxy, and bureaucratic administration."[21]

Several important organizational hierarchies reach from the centre of national power to the local level in Communist China. However, the one with ultimate authority and undisputed importance is the Communist Party which monopolizes the processes of policy making. Next in importance is the government bureaucracy,

21. Doak Barnett, *Cadres, Bureaucracy and Political Power in Communist China*, Columbia, 1967, p. 427.

which in implementing Party defined policies carries the major load of administration. Knowledge of the way in which these parallel hierarchies function and interrelate is essential to any understanding of how the administrative system in Communist China operates.

Under the principles of "democratic centralism" on which the Chinese political system operates, the final decision making authority is highly centralized in both the Communist Party and the government. In the Party the Central Committee elected by the Party Congress is theoretically the ultimate repository of power between congress sessions. In practice, the Politburo and its Standing Committee, together with the Party secretariat, run the Party organization and the Party in turn directs all the other organizations in the country, including the bureaucracy.

In the government, the National People's Congress (NPC) or its Standing Committee, which functions in its name between annual sessions—is theoretically the "highest organ of state powers." Operationally, however, the State Council (Cabinet) and its "Inner Cabinet" (consisting of the premier and deputy premiers) are in charge of the government and are immediately responsible for directing all the ministries and other administrative agencies of the central government, as well as all local governments and administrative agencies.

The NPC is the highest government organ and has constitutional duties similar to those of many parliamentary bodies in other countries. It is empowered to amend the constitution, decides on the national economic plan, and is empowered to make laws and supervise their enforcement. Upon recommendation of the party's Central Committee, the NPC designates, and can remove, the Premier and other members of the State Council, elect the State President and President of the Supreme People's Court and Chief Procurator of the Supreme People's Procuratorate. It is elected for a five-year term and meets at least once a year.

When the NPC is not in session, its Standing Committee serves as the executive body to act on behalf of the Congress (the second Session of the fifth NPC in June 1979 approved a constitutional change which required the establishment of standing committees for People's Congresses at and above the county level). While the Standing Committee is elected by the NPC, it is the Standing Committee which has the power to conduct elections of the deputies of the NPC and to convene the NPC sessions. Since the NPC meets once a year, the standing committee controls a great deal of this body's powers.

The State Council, the nation's highest executive organ, administers the government through functional ministries and

commissions. The Constitution stipulates that the State Council comprise a premier, vice-premiers and heads of national ministries and commissions. The State Council may also include others, such as vice-ministers. The membership of the State Council has ranged from thirty to over one hundred.

Since the full State Council is too large a body for effective decision making, in practice this role has been assumed by an Inner Cabinet of the premier and his vice-premiers.

Doak Barnett has described the State Council as the "command headquarters" for a network of bureaux and agencies staffed by cadres who administer and co-ordinate the government's programmes at the provincial and local levels.

The powers and functions of the State Council have been enumerated in Article 49 of the Chinese Constitution as follows:

1. Formulate administrative measures, issue decisions and orders, and verify their execution, in accordance with the Constitution, laws and decrees.

2. Submit Bills to the NPC or its Standing Committee.

3. Co-ordinate and lead the work of ministries and Commissions.

4. Co-ordinate and lead the work of local administrative organs of state throughout the country.

5. Revise or annul inappropriate orders and directives issued by ministries or by heads of commissions.

6. Revise or annul inappropriate decisions and orders issued by local administrative organs of state.

7. Put into effect the national economic plans and provisions of the state budget.

8. Control foreign and domestic trade.

9. Direct cultural, educational and public health work.

10. Administer affairs concerning the nationalities.

11. Protect the interest of the state, maintain public order, and safeguard the rights of citizens.

12. Direct the conduct of external affairs and defence.

13. Ratify the status and boundaries of autonomous regions, counties, and municipalities.

14. Appoint or remove administrative personnel according to provisions of law.

15. Exercise any other power vested in it by the NPC or its Standing Committee.

Though the People's Republic of China is a unitary state, the country has been divided into administrative units which enjoy merely delegatory power from the Central Government. Constitutionally the whole country is divided into provinces, autonomous regions and municipalities directly administered by the central government. Provinces and autonomous regions are sub-divided into autonomous prefectures, counties, autonomous counties and cities. At the grassroots level, there are people's communes and towns which are the subdivisions of counties and autonomous counties. Municipalities directly under the Central Government, and other large cities are divided into districts and counties. There is also the division of autonomous prefectures into counties, autonomous counties and cities. All the "autonomous" units of administration are national autonomous areas. The term "autonomous" does not mean that they possess special powers which are denied to other units of administration. In fact, like other units of administration they are integral parts of the centralised administrative hierarchy. Doak Barnett says,

> They (the autonomous areas) are different from other units mainly because within them concessions are made to local minority customs and languages and special efforts are made to absorb minority cadres into the local administration.

The various organs of local government are parallel to the organs of Government at the national level. Thus the provinces, municipalities, counties, cities, municipal districts, people's communes and towns—all have their people's congresses and revolutionary committees as deliberative and executive agencies of administration. These bodies are described in the Constitution as the repository of political power at the grassroots level and the leading organs of collective economy.

Administration in China is generally analysed primarily in terms of the major regional levels of authority in the Party and/or government hierarchies, starting from the national level and working downward through the great administrative regions, provinces, special districts, counties and communes. However, the operation of the administrative system as a whole can also be usefully analysed in terms of functional "systems" each of which constitutes a distinct chain of command organized on a nationwide basis and reaching from the centre to the local level.[22]

Interlocking Structure of the Government and Party

The Chinese Communist Party controls and directs the machinery of state through an interlocking system of party personnel and a structure parallel to that of the state government.

22. *ibid.*, pp. 3-10.

Party control and leadership of government organizations are exercised in a variety of ways. Firstly, the central committee's departments, and committees within the Party's own hierarchy form a kind of "shadow government"; as already indicated, each department or committee is responsible for one of the broad functional fields or "general systems" into which most government work falls, and it provides continuous policy guidelines to all the government agencies within that field.

Secondly, Party members monopolize the key leadership posts in government bodies at all levels, and they are directly subject to instructions from higher Party officials as well as from government authorities. Party instructions always have primacy, since the Party is universally recognized as the ultimate authority on policy. Large number of non-party cadres still work in the government, but the number occupying leadership posts, in ministries or any other major government agencies, has steadily declined.[23]

An example of interlocking personnel was Hua Guofeng, who was both Chairman of the CCP and Premier of the government. Besides, the Communist Party chairman automatically becomes the chairman of the Party's Military Affairs Commission, which supervises the armed forces and sets military or defence policies. The first vice-chairman of the party's Military Affairs Commission becomes, by tradition, the Minister of Defence. One of the Party's Vice-Chairmen, Deng Xiaoping, was also the chief of staff of the armed forces. Of the thirty-six ministers in charge of the various governmental agencies elected by the fifth NPC in 1978, twenty-nine, or eighty-one per cent, were members of the Central Committee of the CCP. All major economic ministries, including economic planning, capital construction, research and development, foreign trade, and heavy and light industries were in the hands of ministers who were members of either the Politburo or the Central Committee. In fact, the party's highest policy-making body, the Politburo, is functionally organized parallel to the government ministries, with members specializing in the various governmental activities. In each state bureaucracy there is a party cell of leading CCP members who provide direction to the state organ. The party has always been able to exercise its control in a state bureaucracy by supervising its personnel. Thus, the state structure and the party are not truly parallel entities since they interlock from top to bottom.

Another major element in the system of Party control over government agencies consists of the Party's basic committees and branches, which are established within all government organizations as within other institutions in society where there are sufficient Party members to form Party branches. Party control is reinforced

23. *ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

also by the Party directed mass organizations that exist within all government agencies, from the central government to the county level, for instance, the Young Communist League, the Labour Union, Women's Association. The Party's control is further enhanced by its monopoly of posts in certain areas they control and "watchdog" units within government organizations. These include the personnel units, major staff officers and, supervision units—all of which operate with a relatively high degree of secrecy and wield great power.

Development of the Chinese Bureaucracy

The Cadre System: Government policies and programmes are generally carried out by the staff in the administrative agencies. In the non-communist world, these people are called bureaucrats, the Chinese call them "cadres" or "kanpu" which denotes leadership, skill and capability in an organizational set-up. Thus, we may refer to the State Council members as the Party and central government's leading cadres. The intermediary level of bureaucrats is the middle-level cadres; and those at the bottom level, who must deal directly with the masses, are the basic-level cadres. Every cadre is a party member, but every party member is not a cadre. In short, cadres are the functionaries of the various party and government bureaucracies and have authority to conduct party or government business.

On the basis of their employment, the cadres are divided into three broad categories : state, local, and military.[24] Each group has its own salary classification system with ranks and grades, similar to civil service systems in non-communist countries. Urban state cadres have a system with twenty-four grades, while local cadres have twenty-six grades. Local cadres at the commune level or below are paid directly by the organizations they work for. This ranking system is also associated with status, privileges, and the degree of upward mobility in the career ladder. A cadre's rank, particularly at the state level, is determined not necessarily by length of service or seniority but frequently by educational background, expertise, or technical competence.

Trends in the Cadre System : The term "cadre" has a variety of meanings. In its broadest sense it includes both Party members and non-party staff, who hold any official post in the bureaucratic set up in China at any level. The term implies persons in authority but over the years it has been applied to an increasingly large number who may even be junior officials. As dedicated revolutionaries, the top leaders have fought a steady battle against "bureaucratism" in all its forms and have placed great stress on the need for promoting a "mass line style of work" that demands

24. James C.F. Wang, *Contemporary Chinese Politics : An Introduction*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1980, pp. 118-123.

close contacts between the ruling elite and those ruled, and between different levels within the bureaucracy.

However, the sheer size of the bureaucracy required to rule China, the enormity of its tasks, and the Communists' totalitarian concepts of power, all reinforce the tendency towards a highly organized, stratified bureaucratic structure of authority, in fact, if not in theory. In short, the problems of administering a huge totalitarian nation have been very different from the Party's earlier problems of organizing a revolutionary movement, and it has simply not been possible to create an enormous ruling bureaucracy and still preserve the purity of revolutionary values and outlook.[25]

The Personnel Bureau of every ministry is a powerful organization staffed entirely by Party members, located adjacent to the Party Committee's office and having overlapping personnel with the Committee, its influence derived not only from its responsibility for personnel management but also from the fact that it served as a key "watchdog" or control organ. Since the Party itself retained ultimate control over personnel management including decisions on appointments, transfers, promotions, and disciplinary action, the bureau served in effect as a special extension of the Party apparatus into the government bureaucracy.

Most cadre salaries are not specially high but a cadre's income is relatively good compared to that of an ordinary peasant or a worker. He enjoys a greater degree of financial security than the majority of the population. Moreover, cadre-status qualifies him for free medical care, low-rent housing, cheap food, better than ordinary accommodation while travelling and access to comparatively good schools for his children.

The Chinese explanation for frequent transfers of cadres is that it is necessary to combat "bureaucratism", "localism", "departmentalism" or excessive loyalty to one's organizational unit.

However, the new leaders in post-Mao China apparently are of the opinion that there need not be a contradiction between "reds" (ardent ideologues) and "experts" (skilled technocrats); they have proposed to educate a vast corps of cadres who can be both ideologically correct and professionally competent. Attempts have been made since 1977 not only to reduce the number of cadres and educated urban youth sent to the communes for physical labour but also to improve the living conditions of the government personnel. There are two main reasons why these remedial measures have been taken; firstly, the need for the nation which has embarked on a very ambitious modernization programme, to

25. Doak Barnett, *Cadres, Bureaucracy and Political Power in Communist China*, p. 440.

utilize fully the technical skills of the educated, and secondly, to minimize the constant complaint and resentment by the personnel, particularly the educated urban youth, about the poor living conditions in the countryside. The new leadership in the post-Mao China seems to have recognized that the work of the educated elite and their professional achievements must be acknowledged and given due recognition.

> It remains to be seen how well they will deal with the challenge of increased routinization and bureaucratization to their ideals of revolutionary 'mass line' politics, the steady growth of functional specialization and the growing 'red and expert' problem, the delicate problems involved in determining the correct balance between centralization and the search for higher degree of administrative stability, the problem of managing bureaucratic politics within a system that idealises monolithic unity, and the question of what mixture of persuasion and coercion should be employed in dealing with the population.[26]

Comparison Between the Chinese and the Western Administrative Models

There are some differences in the civil services of China and those of western countries. First, in China there is no independent and impartial recruiting agency like the Civil Service Commissions of these countries. Whereas in other countries, government servants are non-partymen elected on the basis of merit and open competition, in China members of the Communist Party receive preference and they are not recruited in accordance with the well established principles of recruitment. The result is that most of the government employees and officials in China are committed communists.

Secondly in China, there is supposed to be harmony between policy makers and administrators, both follow the same ideological and social base. Civil services are totally controlled by the Communist Party. Civil servants do not form any trade unions.

Civil services in China can be compared with that of the Soviet Union. In both the countries the absence of an independent recruiting agency has been responsible for the fact that large percentage of government employees are members of the Communist Party. The Party members man the top offices of state and economy. It does this through the vigilance and agency of the personnel and other departments of its secretariat.

The Chinese model of administration based on the Maoist ideal of "mass line politics" differs significantly from the western administrative systems based on the Weberian model of bureaucracy. Many of the structural and behavioural features of the

26. *ibid.*, p. 445.

Weberian model have been severely criticised by Mao and he sought to either replace them or substitute some of them with other criteria in his own model of mass based participative administration. The specific feature of the Chinese administrative model which distinguishes it from western models of administration lies in its emphasis on the "politicisation" of administration, its stress on the ultimate political goals of administration, and in the scope of its operations which is much wide and all encompassing in nature than western administrative systems.

The Chinese bureaucracy like its western counterparts is also based on a hierarchy of specialised offices to which people are appointed or promoted but the criterion for appointment or promotion is not essentially technical competence as stressed in the Weberian model. The Chinese scheme favours the politically motivated generalist more than the apolitical technical specialist. In practice, this means considering a bureaucrat's social class origins, Party membership and level of commitment to communist ideals, besides his education and technical skills.

The Chinese model does not emphasise "specialisation" and "professionalism", for various reasons. It is felt that if too much importance is given to a limited number of technical experts it might discourage the spirit and initiative of the ordinary lower ranking members of the administrative network, that is, the "masses" upon whose efforts the Chinese model leans heavily for organisational success. The success of the higher ranking bureaucrats would be judged by their ability to mobilise to the fullest, the cooperation of the energy and initiative of their subordinates in the implementation of decisions. The ordinary workers and lower level cadres should be made to feel capable of making positive contributions to the decisions that vitally affect their lives, and optimistic about their abilities to compete for higher positions. The scope for upward mobility should be fully guaranteed in all bureaucratic organisations to increase the motivation and dedication to work of all cadres, including the lowest in the hierarchy.

Therefore, the functions of the Chinese administrators are not merely technical, both technical and political skills are required of them. As a result technical and political considerations are given importance in appointment as well as promotion of administrative personnel.

Secondly, the Chinese model rejects the Weberian emphasis on the autonomy of bureaucratic organisations and the notion of an "impersonal and natural" bureaucracy as an ideal for all societies. The entire bureaucracy in China operates within a political framework and qualities of political zeal and dedication to political objectives of a communist state are considered virtues which every bureaucrat should cultivate. An apolitical and purely

technical attitude to work is considered sterile and unproductive in the Chinese model. The Chinese communists absolutely reject the need for organisational autonomy, and epithets like "departmentalism" and "localism" are used for bureaucratic organisations trying to assert such autonomy. What this really means is that all organisational decisions are ultimately linked with the political goals of the state which extend beyond organisational boundaries. Political interference within and outside the organisations is viewed as undue interference since it is the duty of political authorities to see that organisational decisions do not have undesirable social consequences and that administrators do not make mistakes and are efficient in their allotted tasks.

The Chinese reject the rational-legal justification of authority and stress more participatory leadership based on comradeship among all levels of the bureaucratic hierarchy. In the Chinese ideal of "mass line" politics, many procedures have been invented to reduce the effects of hierarchy in organisations. Most of the cadres have to spend a considerable part of their schedule doing manual work in rural areas alongside their subordinates. This is done to promote comradeship among various cadre levels and also to enable superiors to get an intimate knowledge about specific administrative problems in rural areas. Also, there are elaborate procedures for mobilising support for decisions made at higher levels. A new policy is announced and explained by policy makers and then cadres at all levels are encouraged to give their suggestions and comments. The fullest participation of the employees at all levels is solicited, the aim being that subordinates by taking an active part in decisions affecting them, will identify more with the organisation and contribute positively towards it. In Chinese organisations participation of subordinates is actively solicited through efforts to formalise and mobilize their informal social groupings. In every organisational unit there are work, study or discussion groups comprising eight to fifteen members, who elect officers, arrange joint recreation, hold outside political study meetings, and engage in group or self-criticism. All these extra-curricular activities are aimed at political indoctrination of cadres at all levels and to increase their involvement in work.

Wage and status differences in hierarchical grades exist in the Chinese bureaucracy but much effort has been made to undermine these by increasing organisational cohesion and communications across hierarchical divisions. Though in the Chinese scheme, to ensure compliance to organisational goals, both coercion and a broad scheme of incentives (material and non-material) remain important, there is a constant endeavour on the part of the political authorities to get people to respond to what Etzioni calls 'normative and social power'. The organisational elements of the Chinese model (the mass line, politics takes precedence, group discussions) are supposed to make this possible. According to the

Chinese if these methods are applied in a proper manner, the bureaucracy at all levels should respond increasingly to social pressure and patriotic appeals, making coercion and material incentives gradually redundant to ensure compliance to organisational goals.

In China no aspect of an administrator's life is considered completely irrelevant to his organisational performance, unlike the Weberian model, where a strict distinction is made between the bureaucrat's personal and official life. Various recreational activities and political indoctrination sessions are organised to utilise the spare time of the cadres to increase their work motivation and dedication to socialist goals. Work timings and schedules in government, organisations and offices may also be changed from time to time to suit political objectives. These efforts tend to make Chinese bureaucracies more total in scope and pervasive in character than their western counterparts. Chinese cadres engage in more activities inside and outside the organisation than bureaucrats do in the West. Finally, the Chinese do not believe in the concept of tenure posts or view bureaucracy as a career. Chinese bureaucrats may hold posts for long periods but they serve at the will of the state. Besides, bureaucrats are frequently transferred from one post to another, up or even down the ladder, to meet the changing demands of the developing economy. Manual labour in rural areas is considered an essential part of their training.

The Chinese also stress the fact that administration should strive to minimise their rules and procedures so that all members, specially the junior personnel, who have new ideas and innovations to improve work, will be able to freely carry them out. Periodically special political campaigns are launched in China to reform organisational methods and procedures and bring administration within easy reach of the masses. They reject the notion of unity of command prominent in classical organisational theory and in the Soviet principle of "one man management". The Chinese stress collective leadership and flexible methods of consultation. Horizontally this means collective decision-making by party committees in consultation with administrators, technicians and workers. Vertically this means referring many kinds of decisions up and down the various levels of the administrative hierarchy, often for ideas, reactions and approval. This procedure obviously results in delayed decision-making to a certain extent, and makes it difficult to specify responsibility at individual level, but the supporters of the Maoist ideal believe it would lead to increased cadre involvement in organisational goals and activities.

The above survey points to the specific features of the Chinese model of administration and how it differs in significant aspects (normatively and operationally) from the western administrative concepts and practices. However, the Chinese administrative

system has also many features in common with the western bureaucracies. The Chinese bureaucracy is organised as a hierarchy of specialized offices in pursuit of specific goals. Its primary task is the implementation of state goals in the social and economic spheres. Authority percolates from the upper to the lower ranks of the bureaucracy, and those at the top generally have more seniority or experience, and receive more wages than their subordinates. Recruitment and promotion are based on universalistic achievement standards; rules and written communications are widely used in Chinese organisations, and offices are separate from office-holders who can be replaced.

Martin King Whyte has attempted a very useful comparison between the western bureaucratic model (based essentially on Weberian thought) and the Chinese model of administration based on the thoughts of Mao. He has explained the similarities and dissimilarities between the two models in the following manner :[27]

Western Conception of Administration

1. Criterion of technical competence in personnel allocation is stressed.

2. Organisational autonomy is promoted.

3. Legal-rational authority should form the base of organizational authority.

4. Informal social groups unavoidably occur in the formal structure of organization.

5. Differentiated rewards to office and performance are encouraged.

6. Varied compliance strategies are needed, depending on the organization.

7. Formalistic impersonality is a characteristic of modern organizations.

8. Another feature of large scale organizations is their unresponsiveness to emotions.

9. There is partial inclusion of limited contractual obligations of office holders.

10. Job security is encouraged in organisations.

27. Martin King Whyte, "Bureaucracy and Modernization in China; The Maoist Critique," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 31, April 1973, pp. 149-163.

11. Calculability of organisational results is through rules and established procedures.

12. There is unity of command and strict hierarchy of communications.

Chinese Conceptions

1. Use both political purity and technical competence.

2. Politics takes command, and opens to outside political demands.

3. Mass line participative charismatic authority is stressed.

4. Informal groups can and should be fully coopted.

5. Differentiated rewards to office and performance are de-emphasized.

6. Normative and social compliance should play the main role everywhere.

7. Comradeship not hierarchy among interpersonal cadre relations is stressed.

8. Political zeal is encouraged.

9. There is near total inclusion and theoretically unlimited obligations.

10. Job security and career orientation are discouraged.

11. Flexibility and rapid-change values, rules and procedures are looked on with suspicion.

12. There is collective leadership and flexible consultation.

Similarities Between the Two Models

1. Organizations have specific goals.

2. Organizations utilize a hierarchy of specialized offices.

3. Authority and rewards are greater at the top of an organization, though the Chinese try to de-emphasize this point.

4. There is universalistic hiring and promotion criteria though the criteria is different in both systems.

5. Files, rules and written communications regulate organizational life.

6. Offices are separated from office-holders.

Underlying the differences between the two models is a general disagreement over the ways organisations are viewed. In the rational bureaucratic type, the chief concern is with achieving internal efficiency through the maximum use of technical knowledge.

In the Chinese conception the predominant emphasis is on finding ways to maximize the involvement and commitment of organizational participants, particularly the masses at the bottom of the organization. While Weber focussed most of his attention on the administration within bureaucracies rather than on the entire personnel, the Chinese focus most of their attention on how subordinates are tied into the organization. The primary concern of the Chinese is with maximizing (human) inputs rather than with getting the most return from limited inputs. Whyte has argued that there is some logic in this approach in China's case. Given her relatively low level of economic development and abundance of unskilled labour, advocates of the Chinese model claim that its implementation will produce full employment and involvement in organizations among participants, thus producing more diligent, careful and creative work.

Thus much of the dysfunctional aspects of Weberian ideal type of rational bureaucracy are seen as avoidable if the Chinese ideal is followed. In other words, the major emphasis of the Chinese model is that only greater involvement can produce greater actual efficiency.

> The Maoist critique of bureaucracy is broad but not total, and organizations with multiple levels of specialized offices continue to exist in China. Individual organizations are controlled and coordinated by national state administrative, army and party hierarchies. If we take size, hierarchy and division of labour as our criteria, rather than other traits on our list, we can say that the Maoists are not rejecting bureaucracy but are trying to make it more responsive and efficient.[28]

28. *Ibid.*, p. 163.

6

PUBLIC POLICY

Significance

Policy can be broadly defined as a proposed course of action of an individual, a group, an institution or government, to realize a specific objective or purpose, within a given environment. Policy formulation is necessary prior to every action in every form of organization, private or public. It is a prerequisite for all management. It is the policy which lays down the framework within which the organizational goals are set to be accomplished. The objectives of an organization which are often vague and general are concretised in the policy goals, which set the administrative wheels in motion. Policy formulation is one of the vital tasks of any government. In the words of Appleby, "The essence of public administration is policy-making". Marshall Dimock defines it as "the consciously acknowledged rules of conduct that guide adminstrative decisions."[1]

Public policies are those which are developed by governmental bodies and officials, though non-governmental actors and agencies may also exert direct or indirect pressure or influence in the policy making process. The special characteristics of public policies as differentiated from other policies emanate from the fact that they are formulated by what David Easton has termed the "authorities" in a political system, namely, "elders, paramount chiefs, executives, legislators, judges, administrators, councillors, monarchs, and the like."

There are certain implications of the concept of public policy. First, purposive or result oriented action rather than random behaviour is the hallmark of public policy. Public policies in modern political systems are not chance happenings. Second, public policy refers to the action or decisional pattern by public administrators on a particular issue over a period rather than their separate

---

1. Dimock and Dimock, *Public Administration*, Rinehart and Co., New York, 1936, p. 82.

discrete decisions on that matter in an ad-hoc fashion. Third, policy is what governments actually do and what subsequently happens, rather than what they intend to do or say they are going to do. Fourth, public policy may be either positive or negative in form. Positively, it may involve some form of government action regarding any issue or problem; negatively, it may involve a decision by government officials not to take action on a matter on which governmental opinion. attitude or action is asked for. Lastly, public policy, at least in its positive form, is based on law and is authoritative. It has a legal sanction behind it which is potentially coercive in nature and is binding on all citizens. This is the main point of difference between public policy and policies of private organizations.

Why Study Public Policy ?

The reasons for studying public policy or engaging in policy analysis may be both academic and political. A study of the policy formulation processes may help to gain greater knowledge and understanding of the complexities of the interacting social, economic and political processes and their implications for society. Policy may be viewed either as a dependent or an independent variable for analytical purposes. When viewed as a dependent variable, the attention is placed on the political and environmental factors that help determine the content of policy. For example, how do the distribution of power among pressure groups and governmental agencies affect the policy outcome, or how do urbanization and national income help shape the content of policy ? If public policy is viewed as an independent variable, the focus shifts to the impact of policy on the political system and the environment. Then the questions arise what effect does policy have on social welfare? How does it influence future policy choices or mobilize support for the political system?

Secondly, factual knowledge about the policy-making process and its outcomes are a prerequisite for prescribing on and dealing with societal problems normatively. Many political scientists believe that the study of public policy should be directed towards ensuring that governments adopt appropriate policies to attain certain desirable social goals. They reject the notion that policy analysts should strive to be value free contending that political science should not and cannot remain politically neutral or silent on vital contemporary social, economic or political problems. They want to improve the quality of public policy in ways they deem desirable, notwithstanding the fact that substantial disagreement may exist in society over what constitutes "desirable" or the "appropriate" goals of policy.

Factors Determining Policy Formulation

Policy formulation in practice often overlaps with the policy decision stage of the policy making process. Formulation aims at

getting a preferred policy alternative approved; an affirmative decision is the reward of the whole process.

A policy decision involves action by some official person or body to approve, modify or reject a preferred policy alternative. If positive, it takes such forms as the enactment of legislation or the issuance of an executive order. What is typically involved at the policy decision stage is not selection from among a number of full blown policy alternatives but, rather, action on what is chosen to call a preferred policy alternative—one for which the proponents of action think they can win approval, even though it may not provide all that they might want. As the formulation process moves towards the decision state, some proposals will be rejected, others accepted, still others modified, differences will be narrowed, bargains will be struck, until eventually in most cases, the policy enactment will only be a formality.

Policy-making cannot be adequately understood apart from the environment in which it takes place. Demands for policy actions are generated in the environment and transmitted to the political system; at the same time, the environment places limits and constraints upon what can be done by policy makers. Included in the environment are such geographical characteristics as natural resources, climate and topography; demographical variables like population size, age and sex ratio distribution and spatial location; political culture; social structure; and the economic system. Other nations become a significant part of the environment for foreign and defence policy. The discussion here will focus on two of these environmental factors to which political scientists have given much importance to, namely, political culture and socio-economic variables.[2] Policy formulation in every country is, in the words of Seckler Hudson, "arrived at, then, in all sorts of ways, conditioned by all sorts of matters."[3]

Political Culture

Culture has been defined as the entire pattern of social life, the inherited modes of living and conduct the individual acquires from his community or environment. Most social scientists agree that culture is one of the many factors that shapes or influences social action. What is relevant here is that part of culture which is called political culture, that is, widely held values, beliefs, and attitudes concerning governmental policies and actions and some of the implications and significance of this culture for policy formation.

Differences in public policy and policy making in various

2. George C. Edwards III and Ira Sharkansky, *The Policy Predicament— Making and Implementing Public Policy*, Allied Publishers, New Delhi 1979, pp. 220-235.

3. Seckler Hudson, *Organization and Management, Theory and Practice*, The American University Press, Washington, 1957, p. 71.

countries can be explained, at least partly, in terms of political cultural variations. Social welfare programmes are older and more widely covered in West European countries than in the United States because there has been greater public demand and approval of such programmes in those countries. Again, government ownership in business and industry is more prevalent in Britain than in the USA where public opinion is more in its favour. Karl Dentsch suggests that the time orientation of people—their view of the relative importance of the past, the present, and the future—has implications for policy formation. A political culture oriented more to the past than to the future may more sanctify age-old traditions, customs and social moves in India than perhaps in the United States, a country whose culture may be more future oriented, adaptable and innovative.

Almond and Verba have differentiated between parochial, subject and participant political cultures. In a parochial political culture, citizens have little awareness of, or orientation towards, either the political system as a whole, or the citizen as a political participant. It is suggested that some tribal societies and modern day Italy are illustrative of parochial political cultures. In a subject political culture, as that of many developing countries like India, the citizen is oriented towards the political system, yet he has little awareness of himself as a participant. He is aware of governmental authority, he may have political views, but he is essentially passive. In the participant political culture, which Almond and Verba found in the United States, citizens have a high level of political awareness and information and have explicit orientations towards the political system as a whole, and a notion of meaningful citizen participation in politics. Included in this orientation is an understanding of how individuals and groups can influence decision making. The implications of these differences in political culture for policy formation seem readily apparent.

Citizen participation in the policy formation in a parochial political culture is going to be essentially non-existent, and government will be of little concern to most citizens. The individual in a subject political culture may believe that he can do little to influence public policy which may lead to his passive acceptance of governmental action that may be rather authoritarian in style. In these cultures chances of popular unrest culminating in violence are very high. In the participant political culture, individuals may organize into groups and otherwise seek to influence government action to rectify their grievances. Government and public policy is viewed as controllable by citizens. Also, one can assume that more demands will be made on government in a participant political culture than in the other two types.

Returning to an earlier point, political culture helps shape

political behaviour, it is related to the why and how of recurrent modes of behaviour in a society. A study of political culture is important because values, beliefs, and attitudes inform, guide and constrain the actions of both decision makers and citizens.

Socio-economic Conditions and Natural Resources

The term socio-economic conditions is used here in the widest sense (geographical characteristics and demographic variables being inclusive in 'economic resources') because it is often impossible to separate social and economic factors as they impinge on or influence political activity.

Public policies can be seen as emanating from conflicts between different groups (private and public) often with opposing interests and attitudes. One of the major sources of conflict in modern societies is economic activity. There are clashes of interest between big and small business, employers and employees, wholesalers and retailers, consumers and sellers, farmers and landlords, workers and industrialists and so on. Groups that are underprivileged, dissatisfied or threatened adversely by economic change very often seek governmental intervention or assistance to improve their lot or status. Thus it was that in many capitalist countries, organised labour, dissatisfied with the wages resulting from union bargaining with employers have often sought minimum wage legislation from the government. Rapid industrialization disrupts the equilibrium of many groups in society. Feudal landed classe lose their importance; new classes emerge like the middle class, big business class and the industrial workers who want a voice in governmental decisions.

It is a well recognised fact that a society's level of economic development will impose limits on what the government can do in providing public goods and services to the community. The scarcity of economic resources will, of course, be more limiting in many of the developing countries than in the affluent ones.

The ways in which socio-economic conditions influence or constrain public policies have been subjected to considerable analysis. Economic development shapes both political processes and policy outcomes. Differences in the policy choices of states with different political systems turn out to be largely a product of differing socio-economic levels rather than a direct product of political variables. Levels of urbanization, industrialization, income and education appear to be more influential in shaping policy outcomes than purely political variables like voter participation, inter-party rivalry, political party strength and legislative apportionment.

Conceptual Approaches to Policy Making

In an article published in 1959[4] and elaborated in his later works Charles Lindblom noted the differences between the way policy making was usually described in theory—the 'rational-comprehensive approach' and the way in which he believes policy actually is made—by 'incremental' steps.

In the rational-comprehensive method, an administrator confronts a given objective, such as reducing poverty by a list of values (in the form of priorities) according to their relative importance. The policy maker in choosing the best policy to pursue, rationally ranks all the relevant 'values' or 'advantages' in attaining this objective, such as improving the health of the poor, reducing crime, and eliminating illiteracy. Then he formulates several possible alternatives to achieve the stated objective, for instance, a guaranteed income plan, direct government subsidies, higher welfare payments, or unemployment relief programmes and selects from among options the best alternative that serves to maximise the ranked list of 'values'. This approach to decision making is rational, because the alternatives and values are logically selected and weighed in relative importance, and also 'comprehensive', for all the alternatives and values are taken into account by the policy maker.

However, the variety of factors both within policy making agencies and from their environment. along with the changes that continually occur in these factors, complicate the policy-maker's task, making rational decision-making difficult.

If a policy maker were to follow the standards of the rational decision-making model he would list and assess all goals that appear relevant to the agency's problems and would then take such steps for each of the policies that appeared capable of achieving each of the potential goals. On the basis of all relevant information about the probable advantages and disadvantages associated with each package of goals and policies, the policy-framer would then select the one best goal-and-policy combination to realise the agency's programme objectives.

The rational model of policy-making expects officials to take every issue into consideration and make clear decisions that can then guide the actions of subordinates. This would result in integrated policies that complement rather than conflict with one another. However, administrators who would accept the prescriptions of the rational model find their way blocked by a number of constraints typical in democratic societies. They reflect the

4.   Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of Muddling Through", *Public Administration Review* 19, No. 2 (Spring 1959), pp. 79-88.

heterogeneity and conflict that are considered by many writers components of the democratic process.

The five major features of public administrative systems that block the fulfilment of rational decision-making by personnel in administrative units include: (1) The multitude of problems, goals and policy commitments that are imposed on or kept from decision makers by actors in the environment of an administrative unit; (2) barriers to collecting adequate information about the variety of 'acceptable' goals and policies; (3) the personal needs, commitments, inhibitions, and inadequacies of decision makers which interfere in their assessment of goals and policies that are acceptable from their agency's point of view; (4) structural difficulties within administrative units and involving their relations with legislative and executive branches of government; and (5) the deviant behaviour of individual administrators.[5] In the face of these problems policy makers tend to seek decisions that will be satisfactory rather than optimal. They avoid as many difficult choices as possible.

The rational method has also been criticised as impractical according to critics. It is impossible to collect all the information and make the complete list of policy options such a process involves; furthermore, the process is very time consuming, and policy makers must act without delay. Besides, the assumption that values can be ranked and classified is also erroneous. Legislators, administrators, and the public frequently disagree about the values a nation should pursue and policy makers do not select values in an abstract manner. Furthermore, according to this method, everything must be considered before new policies are decided. This entails risks because the consequences of adopting new policies are unknown.

What actually occurs in administrative decisions, argues Lindblom, is quite another process, namely, 'the successive limited comparisons' or 'branch' technique. An objective is established, for example, of reducing poverty by a fixed allocation of funds; but in policy making this objective is very often compromised. It may soon be mixed up with other goals such as educating minority students or providing unemployment relief for the jobless. Administrators first take up on a priority basis programmes of immediate relevance. In selecting appropriate policies, they do not outline a wide range of possibilities, but only a few 'incremental' steps which appear to them to be feasible on the basis of their experience. Lindblom states that policy makers do not rationally select the most 'optimal' programme, as a matter of fact, under the 'successive limited comparisons' method public administrators pragmatically select from among the immediate choices at hand the

5.   Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration*, p. 88.

'most suitable' compromise that may satisfy the groups and individuals concerned with the programme.

There are two advantages of 'incrementalism' according to Lindblom. First, if the decision maker proceeds through a succession of small incremental changes, he has the advantage of avoiding serious alterations, should mistakes be made. Second, this method is truly reflective of the policy making process in democratic states which operate chiefly by means of consensus and gradualism and rarely by sweeping changes in public policies. However, Lindblom admits that from the perspective of the 'academic theorist' this approach may seem 'unscientific' and 'unsystematic'. He also acknowledges that incrementalism can result in important policy alternatives being overlooked. Yet, he believes that in democratic societies, individuals are free to combine to pursue almost any possible common interest they may have, so the values neglected by one set of policy makers are likely to be considered by others.

Though it is widely accepted that incrementalism describes the reality of the policy making process, it is also true that problems facing government are often so critical that incremental changes are not sufficient and innovation is required. Amitai Etzioni's 'mixed scanning' addresses itself to this problem, for it combines incrementalism and rationalism.

He agrees with Lindblom's attack on the rational approach but also believes that incrementalism is not without flaws either. He feels that incrementalism discourages social innovation and is partisan in approach; which in reality means that the interests of the most powerful and organized get the maximum attention from policy makers. Besides, incrementalism cannot apply to fundamental decisions such as a declaration of war. Hence Etzioni suggests a 'mixed scanning' approach, combining elements of the rational method with the incremental.

He explains his 'mixed scanning' approach by a simple illustration.

> Assume we are about to set up a worldwide weather observation system using weather satellites. The rationalistic approach would seek an exhaustive survey of weather conditions by using cameras capable of detailed observations and by scheduling reviews of the entire sky as often as possible. This would yield an avalanche of details, costly to analyse and likely to overwhelm our action capacities. Incrementalism would focus on those areas in which similar patterns developed in the recent past and, perhaps, on a few nearby regions; it would thus ignore all formations which might deserve attention if they arose in unexpected areas. A mixed scanning strategy would include elements of both approaches by

employing two cameras: a broad-angle camera that would cover all parts of the sky but not in great detail, and a second one which would zero in on those areas revealed by the first camera to require a more in depth examination. While mixed scanning might miss areas in which only a detailed camera could reveal trouble, it is less likely than incrementalism to miss obvious trouble spots in unfamiliar areas.[6]

Application of Etzioni's model to social problems would lead to a broad social survey in which general information is gathered, such as indices of employment levels. If this revealed trouble spots, the focus should be shifted to an in depth analysis of troubled sectors of the economy. In this way, comprehensive action with respect to the areas studied in detail would be possible encouraging innovation while at the same time recognizing the impracticability of "comprehensive reviews of all community sectors and the stability and predictability of incrementalism would be preserved."[7]

The Official Policy Makers

Official policy-makers are those who are legally empowered to formulate public policy (This does not preclude the possibility of these people being controlled by others, like political party bosses or other interest or pressure groups). These include legislators, executives, administrators, and judges.

Legislatures : Formally legislatures perform the task of law-making in a political system. This does not necessarily mean that they have independent decision making powers or that they actually frame the official policy. It is often said that the British and Indian parliaments merely consent to laws that are originated by political parties and pressure groups, framed by bureaucrats, and introduced in the legislature by the government. This is because the government enjoying a comfortable majority in the legislature, knows that it can get any measure of its choice passed by parliament. In the course of approving legislation the parliament performs other important functions like deliberating, scrutinizing, criticizing, and publicizing government policies and their consequences for the public on the floor of the house. However, in the American system of separation of powers, legislatures often take an independent and final decision in matters of law-making. In the US Congress, the standing committees have ultimate authority over proposed legislation and may even act in opposition to a majority of the members of the House in which they exist. On matters of taxation, civil rights, welfare and labour relations policies tend to be shaped in substantial part by

6. Amitai Etzioni, "Mixed Scanning : A 'Third' Approach to Decision-making", *Public Administration Review* 27, No. 5, Dec. 1967, pp. 389-390.
7. Larry L. Wade, *The Elements of Public Policy*, Columbus, Ohio, Merill, 1972, p. 110.

the Congress. In contrast, in matters of foreign and defence policy, the Congress is guided more by presidential initiatives. An individual legislator while voting will be guided more by his party affiliations than personal bias or ideological orientations. He may also be guided by his constituency requirements in particular cases. In parliamentary democracies voting is essentially on party lines.

In comparison, the Russian and Chinese national legislatures often merely ratify or confirm decisions made by high officials within the Communist Party. It can, thus, be safely concluded that legislatures are more important in policy formation in democratic than in dictatorial countries; and within democratic systems, legislatures generally tend to show greater independence in policy formulation in presidential systems (USA) than in the parliamentary (India).

The Executive : In what has been called an "executive-centred era" modern governments everywhere depend vitally upon executive leadership both in policy formation and execution. In parliamentary countries all policies must have the approval of the cabinet and all important laws in parliament are introduced by the ministers of the government. In the USA the President's option to exercise legislative initiatives is clearly recognised as a fact to stay. The divisions in the Congress resulting from the committee system and lack of strong party leadership render that body incapable of developing consistent and coherent legislative programmes. Consequently, the Congress gradually has come to expect the President to initiate or send proposals for legislation. This does not mean that the Congress acts on the President's commands or merely approves his proposals. The presidential proposals are very often rejected or considerably modified before enactment. In the areas of foreign and defence policy, the President possesses greater constitutional power and operating freedom than in domestic policy. The US foreign policy is largely a creation of presidential leadership and action.

In the developing countries the executive probably has even more influence in policy making than in modern countries. This is because there is often no strong bureaucratic base, and the executive plays a larger role in policy formulation because of a greater concentration of power in governmental hands coupled with less responsiveness to the legislature. In such countries pressure groups have little influence or impact in policy making due to their lack of sophistication or coordination. However, executive decision making is not done in a vacuum. The executive is expected to act in conformity with the constitution, statutes and court decisions. Foreign policy decisions often depend on their acceptability by other nations, while domestic policy decisions may depend upon their acceptance by legislatures, administrators

and the public. Another limiting factor may be availability of resources.

Administrative Agencies : Administrative systems throughout the world vary with respect to size and complexity, hierarchical organization and degree of autonomy. Although it was once an accepted doctrine in political science that administrators were merely executors of policies determined by other organs of governments, the fallacy of this distinction is now being increasingly realised. It is common knowledge now that politics and administration are blended, and that administrators are involved in the policy formulation process in more ways than one.

In complex industrial societies specially, the technicality and complexity of many policy matters, the need for continuing control, and the legislators' lack of time and information, have led to the delegation of much discretionary authority to administrative agencies formally recognized as rule making power. Agencies are also a major source of proposals for legislation in the presidential systems like the United States and parliamentary governments like Britain. Public officials are associated with policy formulation in three important ways. First, they have to supply facts, data and criticism about the workability of policy to the ministers or to the legislature if the initiative for policy-making comes from them. The members of parliament or ministers are a changing body of amateurs who may have political skill or popularity but lack administrative acumen or experience, and as such they have to rely and give due weightage to the suggestions of the officials. Secondly, very often the initiative for policy legislation originates from the administration. This is due to the fact that it is the administrators who are constantly in touch with the general public, and therefore, in a better position to understand the difficulties that arise in the implementation of policies. It is from the bureaucracy that suggestions and proposals for removing those difficulties or amendments in the existing law often emanate. Thirdly, on account of lack of time and knowledge, the legislature passes skeleton acts and leaves the details to the administration. It is here that administrators have the maximum scope for policy making. In order to execute these acts, the administration frames rules, regulations and by-laws which is a significant contribution to policy-making.

The Courts : In countries where the courts have the power of judicial review, they have (as in the United States) played an important role in policy formation. The courts have often greatly affected the nature and content of public policy through exercise of the powers of judicial review and statutory interpretation in cases brought before them.

Basically, judicial review is the power of courts to determine the constitutionality of actions of the legislative and executive

branches and to declare them null and void if such actions are found to be in conflict with the constitutional provisions. The judiciary has played a major role in the formation of economic policy in the United States. Many laws relating to such matters as property ownership, contracts, corporations, and employer-employee relations have been developed and applied by the courts in the form of common law and equity. They originated in England but have been adapted to American needs and conditions by the American judges. Judicial activism in the United States in the past was restricted mainly to the areas of economic regulation and law enforcement but for the past two decades the courts have also ventured into many new areas of social and political activity. Legislative apportionment, the rights of welfare recipients, the operation of public institutions such as public schools, prisons and hospitals and the location of public facilities are major examples of this type. The courts are playing a more positive role not only by specifying the government's limits to action but also by stating what it must do to meet legal or constitutional obligations. The increasing sphere of governmental interference in people's lives, the failure of the legislative and the executive to act on many problems, the willingness of the courts to play a more positive role probably guarantee a continuation of this extended judicial involvement in policy formation even in the future.

In India too, the courts have by their power of judicial review, considerably affected the process of policy making. However, in India, they have often been accused of playing a conservative role in their interpretation of the Constitution which has led to a considerable tussle between the legislature and the judiciary. The main areas of conflict have been the interpretation of the relationship between fundamental rights and directive principles and the legislature's power of Constitution amendment. The verdicts of the courts often went against the government's progressive laws. To overcome the judicial barrier the government had to often resort to constitutional amendment.

Unofficial Participants : Besides the official policy-makers, many others may participate in the policy-making process, like interest groups, political parties and individual citizens. They may considerably influence policy formation without possessing legal authority to make binding policy decisions.

Pressure Groups : Interest or pressure groups play an important role in policy-making in most countries. The strength and legitimacy of groups differs from country to country, depending upon whether they are democratic or dictatorial, developed or developing. Pressure groups are found to be more numerous in the United States or Great Britain than they are in the Soviet Union or China. The main function of these groups is to express demands

and present alternatives for policy action. They may also supply the official law makers with much technical information for and against a specific issue and possible consequences of a policy proposal. Given the plural character of American society, it is not surprising that pressure groups are many and varied in number, interests, size, organization and style of operation. The primary concern of a pressure group is to influence policy in a particular policy matter. Often there are several groups with conflicting desires on a particular policy issue, and policy makers are faced with the problem of having to choose between conflicting demands. Well organized and active groups naturally have more influence than groups whose potential membership is poorly organised and inarticulate. Influence also depends on other factors like numerical strength, monetary and other resources cohesiveness, leadership skills, social status and attitudes of the policy makers on specific policy issues.

Political Parties : In modern societies generally, political parties perform the function of "interest aggregation", that is, they seek to convert the particular demands of interest groups into general policy alternatives. The way in which parties "aggregate" interests is affected by the number of parties. In predominantly biparty systems such as the United States and Great Britain, the desire of the parties to gain widespread electoral support will force both parties to include in their policy proposals popular demands and avoid alienating the most important social groups. In multiparty systems, on the other hand, parties may do less aggregating and act as the representatives of fairly narrow sets of interests as appears to be the case in France. In India, there is a multiparty system, with half a dozen national parties and regional parties of twice the number. Most of the national parties have manifestoes which only differ in stress rather than in content since their common desire is to extend their electoral base as wide as possible. The regional parties, however, are more sectarian in their approach since they desire mainly to woo a particular regional segment of the population. In one-party systems like the Soviet Union and China, they are the chief official framers of public policy. Generally, however, political parties have a broader range of policy concerns than do interest groups, hence they will act as brokers than as advocates of particular interests in policy formation.

In parliamentary states, the political party which has a majority of votes in parliament forms the government which is the chief official policy maker. Needless to say, most of the governments make policies according to the policy manifestoes on which they have been elected to office. In presidential systems like the United States, the fact that members of Legislatures often vote in accordance with their party policy, which party controls the Congress has significant policy implications.

The Individual Citizen : Since democratic governments are representative governments, it is often said that citizens are therefore, indirectly represented in all policy-making. In an abstract sense, this is true, but concretely, this aphorism means very little. Citizen participation in policy-making, even in democratic countries, is very negligible. Many people do not exercise their franchise or engage in party politics. Neither do they join pressure groups nor display any active interest in public affairs. Even while voting voters are influenced comparatively little by policy considerations. However, despite such political attitudes of a great majority of citizens, some still participate directly in decision-making. In some of the American states (like California) and some countries (like Switzerland) citizens can and still vote directly on a legislation or on constitutional amendments which are submitted to the voters for approval. Elections are the major instruments in democratic countries to gauge public opinion or popular wishes. As Charles Lindblom summarizes the argument : "The most conspicuous difference between authoritarianism and democratic regimes is that democracies choose their top policy makers in genuine elections". Some political scientists speculate that voting in genuine elections may be an important method of citizen influence on policy not so much because it actually permits citizens to choose their officials and to some degree instruct these officials on policy, but because the existence of genuine elections puts a stamp of approval on citizen participation. Indirectly, therefore, the fact of elections enforces on proximate policy makers a rule that citizens' wishes count in policy making.

However, it is a truism that no government, however dictatorial, can afford to go against the desires, wishes, customs or traditions of the people. Even dictators will undertake many popular measures to keep down unrest or discontent against the rigime. One-party systems like the Soviet Union, also seem concerned to meet many citizen wants even as they exclude citizens from more direct participation in policy formation.

Policy Formulation in India

The various organizations that participate indirectly or directly in the policy formulation process in India are the legislature, the executive, the judiciary, the administration, political parties, pressure groups and the public opinion. Policy making is very often a cooperative endeavour, a collective effort in which many people and agencies participate. In India some of the important organizations are as follows.

The Constitution : All policies must be in accordance with the Constitution which was adopted as the fundamental law of the land. The Constitution is an elaborate and comprehensive document which clearly states the machinery of the government, its

objectives and its restraints and limits. The Preamble to the Constitution declares the objectives while the Directive Principles have laid down the policy-making framework of the government.

Legislature : Legislatures in the centre and the states enact laws to give effect to the policies laid down in the Constitution. Legislation is the declared will of the sovereign state and an instrument for the expression of public opinion. The role of legislature is primarily to pass or veto policies because by itself it is rarely the forum for initiating or sponsoring legislation. However, it influences public policies through general discussions, debates and various tools of legislative procedure may be adopted for highlighting the merits, demerits, implications or consequences of any policy.

The Cabinet: In parliamentary democracies like India the Cabinet is the chief source of policies. It is the real executive in the country and the major policy-making or originating body. Policies originating elsewhere have also to be approved by it. It operates through several sub-committees which report to it on specific matters.

Public Services: Public services though chiefly concerned with the execution of policies, participate in policy-making in so far as they advise and supply the necessary data to the minister for policy-making; giving legislative shape to the policy proposals and by framing administrative rules and regulations for giving effect to the approved policies.

The Planning Commission: Although it is a staff agency, and acts in an advisory capacity to the government, it exercises much influence over the formulation of policies relating to the entire field of administration. The National Development Council, (comprising the Prime Minister, a few central ministers and chief ministers of all states) is the supreme organization which frames the Five Year Plans. It not only charts out the plans but also recommends the pattern of resources for the implementation of these plans.

The Judiciary : The judiciary influences public policies in two ways : by its power of judicial review (acting as the final interpreter of the Constitution) and by exercising its advisory powers to define, interpret or set the limits of operation of public policies.

Besides, there are various other institutions and agencies which exert direct or indirect influence on the policy formulation processes in India. Mention may be made of the advisory bodies such as the Standing Labour Committee. Import and Export Advisory Committee, Central Advisory Board of Education and the University Grants Commission. Other influencing bodies are pressure groups such as trade unions, chambers of commerce and

various other associations, political parties and the press. All these bodies advise, suggest and sometimes agitate to demand correctives and reforms in reference to a specific policy.

Need for Policy Evaluation

Public policy analysis is concerned with the effect of governmental decisions on the target public. Vital government decisions in all sectors of public concern involve great cost to the nation. Besides involving the tax-payers' money, almost all governmental policies affect vast sections of the citizens, either directly or indirectly. Thus they have every right to know why particular decisions were taken, how they were arrived at, and what would be their likely consequences. These questions are now being raised by policy analysts. Since the government's long term policies and plans will greatly determine the future shape of society, there is a great need now for the building up of scientific knowledge about policy making. To solve critical problems of society, Yehezkel Dror advocates the development of policy science.

> Policy science can ... be partly described as the discipline that searches for policy knowledge, that seeks general policy issue knowledge and policy making knowledge, and integrates them into a distinct study.[8]

Policy issue knowledge is knowledge relating to a specific policy, whereas policy making knowledge concerns itself with the entire spectrum of policy making activity—how it operates and how it can be improved. Dror advocates an optimal approach to policy making and policy analysis. He pleads for the adoption of the best policy by a judicious evaluation of goals, values, alternatives, costs and benefits based on the maximum use of all available information and scientific technology. He even recommends extra-rational aids to facilitate effective policy analysis. Intuition, value preferences, extraordinary leadership and acute reality perceptions may also be used in policy making and analysis.

Policy analysis today is emerging as a subdiscipline with its focus on the following areas:

(a) There is comprehension of policies rather than recommendation. The emphasis is on understanding of policies and not directly proposing new ones.

(b) Efforts will be made for finding causal links on policy matters. Causes and consequences of public policies are now being subjected to scientific enquiry.

8. Yehezkel Dror, *Public Policy Making Re-examined*, Chandler, San Francisco, 1968, p. 8.

(c) There is a need for creation of a body of policy science knowledge. Specific policy issue studies are being utilised for arriving at broader generalisations.

Evaluation of Public Policy : The evaluation of public policy is an attempt to assess the content and effects of policy on those for whom it is intended.[9] Often policy evaluation occurs throughout the policy process, not necessarily at its termination stage. Evaluational activity may restart the policy process (problem formulation onwards) in order to continue, modify or terminate existing policy. There are generally three recognised methods of policy evaluation. They are as follows:

(a) *Policy impact evaluation* : In an assessment of overall programme impact and effectiveness, the emphasis is on determining the extent to which programmes are successful in achieving basic objectives and on the camparative evaluation of national programmes.

(b) *Policy strategy evaluation* : This evaluation is an assessment of the relative effectiveness of programme strategies and variables. The emphasis is on determining which strategies, methods and procedures are most productive or effective.

(c) *Policy project appraisal* : The process is an assessment of individual projects through site visits and other activities with emphasis on managerial and operational efficiency.

While discussing policy evaluation, one must first understand the basic difference between policy output and policy outcomes.

Policy output refers to the quantifiable actions of the government which can be measured in concrete terms, for instance, construction of government offices, schools, public parks, highways, payment of welfare benefits, operation of hospitals and prisons. These activities can be measured in concrete terms but figures reveal very little about the *policy outcomes* or the qualitative impact of public policies on the lives of people. Knowing how much is spent on pupils in a school system on a per capita basis will reveal nothing concerning the effect schooling has on the cognitive and other abilities of students, let alone the social consequences of the educational system.

However, broadly policy evaluation requires knowledge of what is to be accomplished within a given policy (policy objectives), how to do it (strategy) and what, if anything, has been accomplished towards attainment of the objectives (impact or outcomes) and the relation of policy thereto. The most useful method of policy evaluation for policy makers and administrators is the

9. Ira Sharkansky, *Policy Analysis in Political Science*, Markham, Chicago, 1970.

systematic evaluation to determine the cause and effect relationships and rigorously measure the impact of policy. It is, of course, often impossible to measure quantitatively the impact of public policies, especially social policies with any real precision. There are certain barriers that create problems for policy evaluation.

Uncertainty over policy goals: When the goals of a policy are unclear or diffused policy evaluation becomes a difficult task. This situation is often a product of the policy adoption process. Since support of a majority coalition is often needed to secure adoption of a policy, it is often necessary to appeal to as wide a spectrum of persons and interests (often conflicting) as possible. Officials in different positions in the policy system such as legislators and administrators, or national and state officials, may define goals differently and act accordingly.

Difficulty in determination of causality: Systematic evaluation requires that changes in real life conditions must demonstrably be caused by policy actions. But the mere fact that action A is taken and condition B develops does not necessarily mean that a cause and effect relationship exists, for example, the relationship between crime prevention measures and occurrence of crime is not a simple cause and effect relationship. The determination of causality between actions, especially in complex social and economic matters, is a difficult task.

Diffused policy impacts: Policy actions may affect a wide spectrum of people both in the target and non-target categories and also have many intended or unintended consequences. A welfare programme may affect not only the poor but also others, such as tax-payers, bureaucrats and lower income groups. The effect on those groups may be symbolic or material, tangible or intangible.

Difficulties in data-acquisition: A shortage of accurate and relevant facts and statistics may always hinder the work of a policy evaluator. Thus mathematical models may predict the effect of a tax cut on economic activity, but suitable data to indicate its actual impact on the economy is difficult to obtain. Official resistance to provide all types of relevant data may also prove to be a hindrance. Policy evaluation means commenting on the merits and demerits of a policy, that is, value judgements have to be made. Agency and programme officials, bureaucrats and others are naturally going to be concerned about the possible political consequences of evaluation. If the results do not come out in their favour or show them in a wrong perspective, their careers may be in jeopardy. Consequently government officials may discourage evaluation studies, refuse access to data, show incomplete records, or create various other hurdles in the researcher's process of policy evaluation.

Within the government, policy evaluation is carried on in a variety of ways and by a variety of actors. Sometimes it is a systematic activity, at other times rather haphazard or sporadic. In some instances policy evaluation has become institutionalized, in others it is informal and unstructured. A few agencies of official policy evaluation are the legislatures and their committees, the audit office, commissions of enquiry, the Planning Commission and departmental evaluation reports.

Besides, there is much policy evaluation carried on outside the government. The communications media, university scholars, private research institutions, pressure groups and public interest organizations make evaluation of policies that have effect on public officials to some extent. These also provide the larger public with information, publicize policy action or inaction, advocate enactment or withdrawal of policies and often effectively voice the demands of the weaker or underprivileged sections of the public.

The legislative process :   One of the declared functions of the legislatures in democratic countries, is the security and evaluation of the application, administration, and execution of laws or policies.

Policy evaluation is exercised through a number of techniques: (a) questions and debates, (b) various motions in parliaments like call attention, no-confidence, (c) committee hearings and investigations, and (d) the budgetary process. In the course of these activities legislators reach conclusions regarding the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of particular programmes and policies— conclusions that can have serious consequences for the policy process.

The audit process : The auditor's office as in India and the USA, has broad statutory authority to audit the operation and finance activities of government agencies, evaluate their programmes and report their findings to Parliament. In India two committees of Parliament, the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee, have been specially empowered to help in effective parliamentary control over the governmental expenditure. Their main purpose is to see that the budgetary appropriations have been utilized economically by the government for the approved purposes within the framework of the grants. Secondly, they undertake a detailed examination of the annual budget estimates of the government to suggest possible economies in the implementation of plans and programmes embodied therein.

Administrative agencies : All government departments prepare their internal evaluation reports which provide an opportunity to appraise the working of the programmes and projects undertaken by the department, for example, the Budget Division of the Finance Ministry has the power of overview the working of the plans and

programmes of all ministries and departments while framing the budget estimates for every department. Similarly, every department while sending its own demand for grants to the Finance Ministry evaluates in the process its annual plans, programmes and performance.

The organization and methods divisions in ministries also often indirectly perform the task of policy evaluation.

Commissions : The Planning Commission, the Finance Commissions, the Administrative Reforms Commissions and various ad hoc commissions that are set up by the government from time to time also play an important role in public policy evaluation by presenting their detailed, researched reports on the consequences and impact of particular government policies.

To sum up, in modern democratic political systems, public policy making and evaluation are very complex processes. Many participants may be involved, and many factors may affect their outcomes. While analysing the policy process all these relevant factors should be taken into account, so that all possible variables are open to enquiry.

7

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

The Concept of a Career Civil Service

Herman Finer defines the civil service as a "professional body of officials, permanent, paid and skilled." According to E.N. Gladden, "A civil servant may be defined as a servant of the Crown (not being the holder of a political or judicial office), who is employed in a civil capacity and whose remuneration is wholly paid out of monies provided by Parliament."[1] This excludes members of the armed forces and judicial services. The civil service constitutes the permanent executive in the modern state. With the increasing variety in the functions of the civil service—new category of employees (both technical and generalist in character) working under the public sector are being gradually added to the category of civil servants everywhere. Finer has classified the British Civil Service into three broad types—administrative, technical and manipulative. The administrative officers help in policy formulation and execution. The officers in the technical category like doctors, engineers, economists and scientists help in performing tasks of a technical and specialised nature, where special knowledge and training is required. The third category of officials merely implement and execute tasks and decisions handed down to them by members of the civil service belonging to the first two categories. The major requirement of the civil service is that it shall be "impartially selected, administratively competent, politically neutral and imbued with the spirit of service to the community."[2]

Though traces of some sort of a rudimentary civil service were to be found in ancient China, Egypt and India, the concept of civil service as a career is of comparatively recent origin. England had no permanent civil service until the middle of the nineteenth

1. E.N. Gladden, *The Civil Service, Its Problems and Future*, Staples, London, 1948, p. 35.
2. *ibid.*, p. 35.

century and the USA until the end of that century. The prevalence of the "patronage system" in England and "spoils system" in the USA delayed the development of a public career system based on merit for a long time.

Dr. White has stated that Richelieu in France, Henry VIII and Elizabeth I in England, and the Great Elector in Prussia are among the chief architects who reconstructed the concept of the state, office, civil life, and of permanent officials out of the debris of the feudal system.[3] Dr. Finer elaborates the principles of its origin thus:

> The growth of some of the cardinal and least questioned principles of modern civilization brought about the establishment and growth of a professional civil service, and the realization of principles would have been impossible without such a service. Some of those principles were the principles of specialization and division of labour, the democratic idea of 'career open to talents' etc.[4]

Civil services are the chief instrument for implementation of the will of the state as expressed through public policy. They are indispensable to the functioning of the modern state. With the change in the philosophy of the state from *laissez-faire* to social welfare the modern state has taken upon itself multifarious tasks which are performed by the civil service.

The basic task of the civil servants is to transform policies into action. The higher echelons of the civil service also assist their political superiors in policy-formulation by expert advice, assistance and information, where needed. With the diversification of the nature of civil service personnel, civil servants of the technical category engaged in various productive and public sector organisations are rendering useful social and economic services to the people.

> The new tasks of the civil servants are therefore, comprehensive and include planning, control and guidance of the entire economic as well as social activities .... The manner in which work is done and its efficiency now directly impinge on the lives of individual citizens. The welfare of the people will, to an increasing extent, depend on the imagination and sympathy and the efficiency with which work is understood and done by the civil servants.[5]

3. L.D. White, *The Civil Service in the Modern State*, p. 11.
4. Herman Finer, *Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1949, p. 712.
5. "Organization Theory and Civil Service Reform in Public Administration", *Journal of the Royal Institute of Public Administration*, Vol. 43, pp. 313-316.

Due to increasing significance and importance of the civil service in modern society and the assumption of responsibility by the state for the performance of various social and economic functions, it has become all the more necessary to recruit persons with special qualifications. Recruiting the right people of merit and competence for the civil service has become a fundamental imperative. Professionalization of the civil service became absolutely necessary to attract the best available talent to government jobs and enable them to make a rewarding career of it. The concept of career civil service was defined by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel appointed in 1933 by the US Social Science Research Council thus :

> By this we mean that steps shall be taken to make public employment a worthwhile life work, with entrance to the service open and attractive to young men and women of capacity and character, and with opportunity of advancement through service and growth to posts of distinction and honour.[6]

According to the Commission, the main characteristics of a career civil service are:

(i)   high prestige and status attached to government service;

(ii) appropriate recruitment procedures;

(iii) broad avenues for promotion and transfer of personnel;

(iv) clear pay scales; and

(v)   an adequate retirement and pension system.

Willoughby defines career civil service as :

> A system that offers equal opportunities to all citizens to enter the government service, equal pay to all employees doing work requiring the same degree of intelligence and capacity, equal opportunities for advancement, equally favourable conditions and equal participation in retirement allowances and makes equal demands upon the employees.[7]

It is a system aimed at recruiting young men and women of talent and ambition, with capacity for learning and growth, training them in order to develop their potentialities for the service of the state.

The main characteristics of the concept of career civil service are : (a) permanence of tenure and stability of service, (b) equal opportunity of competing for government service, (c) merit to be the sole criteria of recruitment with due recognition to ability and personal efficiency in a sound promotion system, (d) the extent of

6.   W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration*, p. 208.
7.   *ibid.*, p. 208.

territorial jurisdiction of public employees is fairly large. This not only enlarges their scope of activity but also improves their avenues of promotions; and (e) adequate steps are taken to provide in-service training to the civil servants to keep them in touch with the latest trends and developments in administrative theory and practice. According to Powell, two new provisions should be included in any modern career system.

The first is the idea of planned upward progression, involving both the identification of a career ladder and carefully execut-ed plans for the continuing growth and development of those who are expected to climb it. The second new element is the advance planning of staffing needs.

The system of a career civil service is applicable to all ranks of administration from the highest to the lowest grades. It can be usefully applied to all levels of government national, state and even local government services. Professionalization of public services have many advantages. In the words of Milton M. Mandell :

The advantages are teamwork and continuity in administra-tion and an effective way of attracting the ablest candidates to the public service.

It is a system of service, with recruitment on merit, security of tenure and due recognition of service and merit through timely promotions. It offers a respectable life career which relieves ian employee from fear of want during service as well as after retrre-ment (government service has pensionary benefits) while assu ing him ample job satisfaction, and opportunities of self-advance-ment if he shows the necessary ability in work. This gives the tate a class of non-political permanent corps of loyal and industri-sous officials who form the backbone of public administration.

Every public organisation constitutes its own service systems comprising permanent civil service groups, whose size and functions depend on the nature of the organisation. Most government departments in all countries have employees who are normally recruited at the lower grades, the senior positions being filled by promotion from below. Modern civil service constitutes men and women with both general and technical qualifications leading to the oft publicised debate on generalists versus specialists (the bureau-crats versus the technocrats).

The concept of a career civil service has been accepted and prevalent in India for a long time. Recruitment to the Indian Civil Service is based on the principle of equal opportunity for all. Recruitment at all levels is made through competitive examinations open to all graduates from any discipline (arts, science, medicine engineering, commerce and law). The entrance examination to the

Indian Administrative Services is meant to attract the very best talent of the country irrespective of sex, caste, or creed. Candidates are recruited at an early age (from 21 to 26 years) and are given extensive in-service training in administrative thought and practice to equip them for their tasks. Promotions are based on the merit-cum-seniority principle and the scales of pay are revised to keep pace with the rising price index. Pension schemes are fairly attractive. Due to the large intake in these services, it has managed to attract an overwhelming number of young men and women in the country, as is evident from the large numbers who take the civil service examination every year.

Recruitment of Civil Service Personnel

Recruitment of personnel for the civil services is one of the crucial tasks of modern government and lies at the heart of the problem of personnel administration. The main test of any machinery of recruitment lies in its ability to recruit the right type of persons for the right jobs. The concept of a career civil service assumes that public service recruitment would be based on the principle of merit and equal opportunity for all. The recruitment process should be able to attract the best available talent among the youth to the civil services. The increasing diversification of the nature of civil service functions and the growth of democratic and equalitarian principles have largely determined the normative context of personnel recruitment in democratic countries. J.D. Kingsley says:

> Public recruitment may be defined as that process through which suitable candidates are induced to compete for appointments to the public service. It is thus an integral part of a more inclusive process—selection—which also includes the processes of examination and certification.

Pfiffner and Presthus observe,

> Personnel recruitment for the second half of the twentieth century will have to be geared to a nuclear physical world in which the solutions of human problems will demand the utmost in human competence. The emphasis will be not only on finding, but on building men who are capable of performing the complex tasks of co-ordinating institutions growing even more complex.[8]

The first country to develop a scientific system of recruitment was China where recruitment through competitive examinations was first introduced in the second century before Christ. In modern times Prussia was the first to introduce a system of recruitment gradually replacing the 'patronage' system from 1857 onwards. In

---

8.   Pfiffner and Presthus, *Public Administration*, p. 294.

the United States, the 'spoils system' was discarded in favour of the 'merit principle' by the Civil Service Act of 1883. In India, the merit principle has been in existence since 1853, when it was first introduced during the British rule.

The process of recruitment and selection includes a number of different steps which are as follows :

1. Announcement of examinations, through newspapers, journals and other media.

2. Holding of examinations fors testing or determining the abilities of the recruits.

3. Certification is the process of sending for an appointment.

4. Selection is the act of choosing from eligible candidates.

5. Appointment is made by the competent authorities of selected recruits. Appointment may be permanent, temporary, provisional or probationary.

6. Placement refers to the putting of recruited persons in the right jobs.

7. Orientation means induction into the service and a certain amount of training for a particular job.

The recruitment process involves a number of problems. They are as follows:

(a) Location of the recruiting authority;

(b) methods of recruitment;

(c) qualifications of the employees;

(d) methods of determining qualifications; and

(e) administrative machinery for determination of qualifications.

(A) LOCATION OF THE RECRUITING AUTHORITY

The problem of location is of such fundamental importance that it is usually provided in the Constitution of most democratic countries. Generally, there are two methods of locating the recruiting agency. In one system, the power is vested in the electorate. This effective system of recruitment is usually adopted for policy making posts (e.g. chief executive) or in electing personnel of a local administration (e.g. village panchayats).

The other system is where the power of appointment is given to a government organisation. Constitutionally the recruiting power is vested in the chief executive but in reality autonomous bodies called Public Service Commissions function as the personnel recruiting agency on behalf of the government.

(B) METHODS OF RECRUITMENT

There are two main methods of recruitment, one is recruitment from outside and the other is through departmental promotion. The latter is one in which appointment to the higher posts in the service is made only from within the service itself either through a system of promotion or through restricted competitive examinations. It has been argued that the best method is to have direct recruitment in the lower grades and recruitment through promotion in the higher grades of service. Such a system will have the following advantages:

(1) All employees are provided enough incentive to work knowing that promotion is guaranteed by well defined conditions of service. Higher posts will have the advantage of the ability of experienced and senior experts.

(2) Gradual advancement through increased monetary benefits is a good form of compensation for those who may put up with low salaries at the junior level.

(3) Besides monetary advantage, there is no guarantee in the system of recruitment from without that it would be able to secure efficient employees to senior positions. Most governments would prefer 'insiders' to 'outsiders' in highly responsible posts.

(4) In the system of recruitment from without, no system of examination can be entirely foolproof or satisfactory in discovering the best talent among the candidates. In the promotion system, more weightage is given to past experience and the degree of responsibility previously enjoyed by a person.

(5) This system reduces the expense and burden of the Public Service Commissions by restricting the work of recruiting and training new applicants to only the lower level posts.

The main defects in this system vis-a-vis the other (recruitment from without for all posts) are that it narrows the area of selection, (a mediocre may fill the post leaving out the more talented). It is also discriminatory and violative of the principle of equal opportunity to all. Direct recruitment ensures a continuous supply of fresh talent and ability. This is particularly essential in technical and professional fields where new techniques and ideas continue to emerge rapidly, in tune with the changing socio-economic conditions of the country.

Neither of the two methods of recruitment are entirely satisfactory. In all countries a combination of both systems is practised to get the most desirable results.

(C) QUALIFICATIONS OF THE EMPLOYEES

One of the main problems in the recruitment system of modern

civil service is the laying down of proper qualifications to suit the needs of the diverse tasks of administration. Broadly there are two types of qualifications required of public servants, general and special.

General Qualifications

The modern state lays down certain general standards for its employees. They relate to his civil status, domicile, sex and age.

Civil status : Since the growth of nation-states it has become a universal practice to recruit only citizens. Even when the services of an alien are indispensable, the appointment is made only on a short term basis.

Domicile : The domicile qualification is generally laid down in public services in countries with federal systems. This qualification was first introduced in the USA to give due representation to each federating unit in the national services. Several critics brand it an undesirable and decidedly harmful practice impeding efficiency and introducing provincialism and parochialism in administration.

In India domicile rules were prevalent till 1957 and have been discarded now.

Sex : Public service, until recently, was taboo for women in most countries, a restriction which gradually disappeared with spread of the influence of the doctrine of equality, and the increasing employment of women in all types of services. In India all public services have been thrown open to women.

Age : In countries like Britain and India where the concept of civil service as a career has been adopted, comparatively lower age limits for clerical and semi-skilled jobs (between 16-20 years) and for administrative and technical (21-26 years) have been provided. But America which does not follow the government service-as-a-career principle prefers to recruit trained and experienced personnel in public service. Hence the age scale there varies from 18 to 50 years.

Special Qualifications

Educational : In respect of educational qualifications, different countries prescribe different patterns. The British system lays down definite educational qualifications for entrants, with an emphasis on liberal education (classical and the humanities). In India every university graduate can sit for the civil service competitive examinations and the subjects are so broad based as to include the widest range of university subjects. The American system being influenced by the doctrine of equality does not prescribe any educational qualifications. Anybody who qualifies in the competitive examination may enter the civil service.

Technical Experience : Technical experience is an additional qualification often laid down for technical services. This is essential to fill up technical posts in public administration by professionals like doctors, engineers and lawyers.

Personal Qualifications : The public servant is required to possess many personal qualifications like integrity, resourcefulness, tact and sincerity. Besides devotion to public duty, other desirable qualifications are :

(a) A flexible, but essentially scientific mode of thought, characterised by a recognition of the need for co-ordination.

(b) Familiarity with the subject-matter of organisation and management.

(c) Facility at problem solving.

(d) A highly developed reading and writing ability.

(e) Ability to settle vexing situations through interpersonal contact.[9]

(D) METHODS OF DETERMINING QUALIFICATIONS

The following methods of determining qualifications have been adopted in most countries today:

1. Personal judgement of the appointing authority.

2. Certificates of character, ability, and educational qualifications.

3. Record of previous experience—educational and occupational.

4. Examinations.

1. Personal Judgement of the Appointing Authority

Under this system, the recruiting authority lays down the qualifications of the applicants. This being a highly arbitrary and subjective system, it has mostly been discarded in democratic countries, where this job has been left to the Public Service Commissions. However, this system can be followed when there is a small number of posts to be filled and an appointing officer is by qualification and experience the best person to lay down the qualifications. At present few top positions of the civil service in India and in some other countries are filled by this system. The most desirable use of this method can be made if the recruiting authority has to make the appointment from a panel of names

9. *ibid.*, p. 296.

prepared by the Public Service Commissions on the basis of competitive examinations.

2. Certificates of Character, Ability and Educational Qualifications

This method is often used to supplement other methods before appointing a person to a public post. Character certification and academic recommendations from responsible persons can be good methods of judging a candidate's past record. However, this cannot be the sole basis of judging the overall fitness of a candidate for a post, for character certificates may be subjective and not always relevant to the requirements of the post.

3. Record of Previous Experience

In this, the entire previous record of work, (both educational and occupational) of the candidate is examined. The USA has evolved a scientific system of making records of the work and experience of employees through what is known as 'Efficiency Records' or 'Service Ratings'. This combined with the educational record of a candidate can serve as a sound basis of preliminary selection as is usually done.

4. Examination

Civil Service Recruitment Examinations are meant to test not only the general knowledge and mental ability of the candidates but also some of their personal traits and service records.

There are four main types of personnel recruitment tests, namely : (i) written examination, (ii) oral examination, (iii) performance demonstration, and (iv) evaluation of education and experience.

Written Examination

Written tests may be either essay-type or objective type in form. Essay type are meant to examine the power and clarity of expression and the standard of logical thinking of the candidate. The objective type is usually employed to test the general knowledge and speed of thinking of the candidate. Either or both types are employed in civil service recruitment. Written tests fall under the following main categories:[10]

(1) The ability tests : They may be either objective or essay type in form. In both, the purpose is to assess the general mental ability of the candidate, his memory, response to problems and power of logic. Besides, other tests have been derived in the USA to test the specific character traits of candidates.

10. A.R. Tyagi, *Public Administration*, p. 438-440.

They are:

(*a*) *General intelligence test* was invented by Binet and Simon of America in 1905. It is a device of measuring the mind through such measures as Intelligence Scale and Pressey Series.

(*b*) *Unit trait system* was devised by L.L. Thurstone. Unit trait system is a process of identifying unit traits of intelligence, for example, perception, space factor, memory, reasoning ability and comprehension.

(*c*) *Social intelligence test* was also devised by Thurstone and his group. It measures the quality of social intelligence, that is, the quality of adaptability to all kinds of new situations and ability to influence people.

(*d*) *Administrative ability* test is known as the Gottshchold test and it tests the administrative ability. Some of the qualities tested are (a) ability to appraise people; (b) capacity to take prompt decisions; and (c) social behaviour.

(*e*) *Mechanical intelligence test* is used to test the ability of mechanical performance needed for lower level skilled and semi-skilled grades e.g. clerks, stenographers, typists and machine operators.

2. *Apptitude tests* : Various aptitude tests are extensively used for recruitment in the defence and other technical services in the UK and the USA which are meant to test the particular aptitude of the students towards that job.

3. *Achievement tests* : The academic qualifications laid down for recruitment to various services are referred to as achievement tests, for example, in India the achievement test for taking the Civil Service Examination is graduation.

4. *Personality tests* : Various kinds of complex personality tests have been devised in western countries to discover all possible traits of human personality, such as the Laired Personal Inventory was devised to measure emotion and temperament; Bern reuter Flanagan Personality Inventory to test confidence and sociability; and Alloport A.S. Test to test qualities of ascendance and submission. These are highly complex psychiatric devices meant to test hidden traits of human personality.

5. *Oral interview* : However, the commonest, least complex and expensive method of personality test is the *viva voce* (also called the oral interview.) This test is normally supplemented by a written test. The interview is generally conducted by a board of three to five experts consisting of members appointed by the Civil Service Commissions. These tests can never be entirely free from bias and subjectivity. They are meant to test the candidate's alertness, intelligence, presence of mind and general personality.

(E) ADMINISTRATIVE MACHINERY FOR DETERMINING QUALIFICATIONS

The task of handling the recruitment of the civil service is such an immensely lengthy, time-consuming and complex job that it needs to be placed in the hands of an agency outside the operating service to maintain standards of objectivity and neutrality in personnel selection. Such a personnel recruiting agency, usually called the Public or Civil Service Commission, is put in charge not only of the recruitment and examination of public personnel but is also entrusted with other duties related with personnel matters, such as pay, leave, promotion, transfer and classification.

In recent years procedures of recruitment and training of personnel have been the subject of serious debate and discussion in many countries. In Britain the Fulton Committee was appointed by the British government to review the entire range of problems connected with personnel administration with special relevance to recruitment and training. The Committee, in its report, published in 1968, first initiated the debate on the 'generalist *vs.* specialist' controversy, making a strong advocacy for relating jobs to organisational objectives and pleaded for increased professionalism in the public services. The essence of the Fulton report was that the days of the 'amateur' in administration are over and the concept of a generalist administrative class is obsolete and insufficient to meet the changing needs of the times. In India, the Administrative Reforms Commission also made a vigorous plea for the gradual infusion of specialists in the administrative services to meet the technological challenge to our administration.

The Fulton report had a snowballing impact on the generalist *vs.* specialist debate with many administrators and academicians vociferously taking one side or the other. The generalist's cause was presented with great vigour and force by Frederick C. Mosher who found the continuous swamping of the US civil services with professionals and technocrats as a dangerous and harmful trend for democratic administration. This view was also supported by Paul Appleby who has stated that there is no single problem in public administration equal to "the reconciliation of the increasing dependence upon experts within an enduring democratic reality." Both these writers view professionalism as a serious threat to the two democratic ideals of public service, viz., recruitment on merit (equal opportunity to all) with responsiveness to political direction. The pro-generalist writers also assert that specialists can never acquire the broadness of vision and outlook, so necessary in a developing nation like India where the complexity of administrative problems calls for an administrator to be a planner, a manager and an operator at the same time.

Both the views have many points of truth. But both the approaches need not be mutually exclusive, a harmonious blend of generalism and specialism may yield fruitful results. The

bureaucrat often lacks specialised knowledge on many matters required for certain jobs, the technocrat may lack broad overview on many matters of administration. The changing problems and socio-economic conditions today call for an administrator who not only helps in policy formulation and execution but also acts as an agent of social change where necessary.

Forms of Recruitment

There are three main forms of Civil Service Recruitment. They are as follows:

1. Cadet System : The cadet system is followed in many countries mainly for recruitment in the defence services. Under this system recruitment is made at a young age, usually between the ages of 16 and 20 years, followed by a long period of institutional training during which the cadets are given instruction on courses in general education and specialized skills required for the jobs.

2. General Mental Ability : The system which is followed in India and many European countries lays stress on recruiting young men and women after graduation in the liberal arts of basic sciences between the age group of 21 to 26 years. Under this the government seeks to recruit candidates with broad educational attainments and mental ability. It is based on the concept of career civil service.

3. Expertise : The government recruits people with specific qualifications, technical knowledge or experience suited for the recruitments to various posts. The age-scale of recruitment varies from 18 to 45 years. This system is followed in the USA and in Canada to a certain extent.. In this open recruitment from outside takes place at all levels of the hierarchy and government service is not based on the concept of a career civil service. Eligible candidates from non-governmental positions may also be recruited to government posts, if required. This system has the same objectives as the 'lateral entry system' under which a certain quota is fixed for recruitment to the senior civil service posts from among outsiders not belonging to the same service through competitive selection. The 'lateral entry system' may be followed in recruitment on the basis of general mental ability.

Recruitment System in India

In India recruitment system is essentially based on the British pattern. Recruitment qualifications at the initial stage are not based on any kind of specialized knowledge or experience. The method of testing merit of the applicants is to assess the general knowledge of the candidate on a variety of subjects. Entrance to civil services is based on merit which is tested by competitive examinations open

to all citizens irrespective of religion, sex, caste or creed. Graduation is the minimum qualification necessary to take these examinations. Direct recruitment to the administrative and most of the executive services is made on the basis of competitive examinations based mainly on the following:

(a) a test of intellectual ability and scholastic attainments through written examinations on subjects of the candidate's choice (optional papers);

(b) a written test common to all candidates, meant to test the capacity for clear and logical thinking, memory, expression and general knowledge (compulsory papers); and

(c) an interview to assess a candidate's personal qualities.

Recruitment by promotion is also made at lower levels of services. Following the recommendations of the Kothari Committee the recruitment to the All-India and Central Services (Class-I) is made on the basis of a combined civil services examination common to all the services in three stages :

(i) Civil services preliminary examination (objective type) for the selection of candidates for the main examination;

(ii) Civil services main examination (written);

(iii) Interview of those candidates who have qualified in the written test at the final stage of recruitment.

Criticism

There are many critics of the method of recruitment to the public services who have time and again pointed out the defects in the system. Dr. Appleby comments "that the examining techniques are not up-to-date and conscious criteria not fully related to modern knowledge about administrative qualifications."[11] He also remarks,

There is too little willingness to recruit in intermediate and higher levels, too much reliance on promotion from below but with promotion limited too strictly to the single 'class' to which a person was first appointed. There is too much unwillingness to recruit in sufficient numbers, even for present needs, and too little realization that future needs of far more serious dimensions cannot be met in the future except by additional recruitment and training now.[12]

The interview system has also often been criticised. A.D. Gorwala observes, "a fifteen minute conversation with laymen

11. Paul H. Appleby's Report of a Survey of Public Administration in India, 1953, p. 11.

12. *ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

howsoever wide experience they might be possessing, cannot take the place of an expert psychological examination designed to give a scientific insight into the candidate's mental and emotional make-up.[13] He also feels that "there is need for a great deal of more contact between the Public Service Commissions and the universities."

The Administrative Reforms Commissions have also in their periodic reports pointed out the flaws in our recruitment policy from time to time and called for an adoption of a more relevant and imaginative policy in future.

Training

Training is the systematic imposition of skilled knowledge to all categories of civil servants for their advancement and efficiency in service. Training of civil servants has assumed special significance in the context of the recruitment policy in democracies which is meant to test the general abilities of candidates yet are, however, not quite enough to carry them through for the rest of their career, once they are selected. With the gradual diversification and complexity of the functions and tasks of government, occupants of public offices have to be trained for their jobs. The practice of advanced countries has amply proved the effectiveness and utility of such in-service training. To meet the challenges of continuing socio-economic change, the administrator of today and tomorrow has to be kept abreast of the latest developments in administrative theory and technique to deal with all kinds of situations. An indication of the growing importance of training is the gradual proliferation of training programmes and institutions to train civil servants in all countries. According to A.D. Gorwala the general conception of training is a mixture of many elements.

In one sense, training means the imparting of knowledge of facts and their inter-relations—knowledge essentially of specialised or professional nature .... In another sense training involves the teaching of techniques which require the coordinated handling of tools and appliances and physical faculties rather than of ideas .... In still another sense, training entails the formation of mental and physical habit patterns to ensure that the same stimuli would always produce the same automatic responses; finally, training implies what the good gardener does to the growing sapling ....

Training helps the recruit to acquire occupational skill and knowledge and contribute his best towards the objectives of the organization. Training moulds and shapes the entrants to internalise the organisational skills and character, and helps them to adapt to new environments. As Nigro puts it, "The function of

13.   A.D. Gorwala's Report on Public Administration, 1957, p. 63.

training is to help employees grow, not only from the standpoint of mechanical efficiency but also in terms of the broad outlook and perspective which public servants need."[14] Training is necessary to equip civil servants for higher positions and greater responsibilities where specialised knowledge and increased competence may be needed. Training not only enhances the competence and ability of civil servants but in the process contributes to organisational efficiency and prestige. It also fosters a spirit of camaraderie and a sense of duty among the employees. Training helps build integrity and morale in the public servants by developing the requisite mental attitudes to questions of personal and public conduct. The British Committee on the Training of Civil Servants, in 1944, has outlined five main aims of training:

(1) attainment of precision and clarity in the transaction of business;

(2) continuous adjustment to the changing socio-economic needs of our times;

(3) gain a broad overview of administration instead of a narrow departmental vision;

(4) vocational training is needed to understand the nature of present task and undertake new responsibilities; and

(5) enliven the nature of routine tasks by making them more interesting.

According to Simon, three factors have given particular urgency to training for government service in developing countries : the need for innovation in administration to meet the demands and challenges of our times; the rapid multiplication of government tasks and duties; and the acute shortage of skilled manpower in developing countries. Training is absolutely necessary to develop personnel quality and resources in Third World countries.

Types of Training

Training can be of several types. Some types may be for individuals, whereas other types may be for groups. There can be pre or post-entry training, as well as training on and off the job. It can be of a specialised or of a general nature. They are discussed briefly as under:

Formal training : This requires classroom lectures, seminars, debates and discussions combined with tutorials and work projects. It may be full-time or part-time, pre-entry or post-entry in nature. It may be given at a particular venue during a specified period, after which a degree or certificate may be awarded to the trainee.

14. Felix Nigro, *Public Administration—Readings and Documents*, Rinehart and Co., New York, pp. 253-254.

Pre-entry training : Any educational qualification or training which prepares a candidate for civil service, including education imparted in schools and colleges is pre-entry training, as it aims to prepare students for eventual public employment. The term pre-entry training is however limited to referring to vocational or specialised training. In India there is hardly any specific pre-entry training scheme in existence. In the United States a rather wide pre-entry training scheme exists (for candidates selected for administrative and managerial positions) where students in the course of their technical education undergo internship or apprenticeship in selected organizations before taking up formal employment.

Orientation training : The orientation training is the planned and guided introduction of employees to their departments and environment of work. The new recruit is guided and oriented towards the work programme and to the diversity of factors involved in a work situation.

Post-entry training : The post-entry training refers to the training an employee gets in service. It may be formal or informal in structure and content. Lectures may be combined with work experience.

Organization of Training

Establishment of a suitable machinery for organising training is very vital for the continued efficiency of the civil services. The different channels through which training can be imparted are as follows : (i) Senior officers of various departments may themselves undertake the responsibility of training juniors. (ii) Training may be conducted in the origanization by outside institutes. (iii) Employees may be sent to outside institutions or universities to get training. Both formal and informal training is necessary if the employee is to specialise and keep an active interest in his job.

Techniques of Training

Many types of training techniques have been evolved in various countries, mainly the USA. The more important among these are : lecture method, syndicate method, case study method, role play and managements games, and sensitivity training.[15]

Lecture method : The lecture method is one of the commonest and oldest methods of training in classroom teaching. However, to make it more effective it should be supplemented with post-lecture debates and discussions, seminars, conferences and other audio-visual methods.

Syndicate method : The syndicate method is now widely

---

15. A.R. Tyagi, *Public Administration, Principles and Practice,* pp. 458-459.

followed in training institutes in various parts of the world. In this method a topic under instruction is assigned to small groups of trainees who are asked to conduct a thorough study of that subject under the guidance of the teachers. Syndicates are of two types—problem solving and knowledge gathering.

Case study method : Under the case study method an intensive and in depth study of a particular subject is undertaken by narrating the actual field experience of working with the problem to trainees by experienced persons. The case narrative is first studied and then debated upon by the students with the teachers.

Incidence method : The incidence method is a problem solving approach meant to develop decision-making skills in the trainees. Students are given instruction on basic administrative facts and problems. On the basis of these facts some problem areas are identified and students are asked to write solution to these problems and defend their answers. This enables them to develop reasoning and problem solving skills.

Role play and management games : In this method trainees are told to enact concrete roles related to their jobs as a part of demonstrative training. Management games are also similar in nature. After the play-acting a debate takes place on the character acting of each trainee in a discussion of creative criticism.

Sensitivity training : The sensitivity training is one of the latest methods of attitude conditioning of civil servants to groom them towards requisite modes of behaviour. Trainees are exposed to groups who make them aware of their peculiar character traits (if any), thus providing them an opportunity for self-analysis and inprovement.

Training in India

Post-entry training of civil servants in India is the responsibility of central and state governments. This initial post-entry training is imparted in two ways—institutional training (for administrative, policy, audit and accounts, and income tax services); and (ii) training under the guidance of senior and experienced officers (for Defence, Accounts, Customs, Postal Services etc.) There are various central institutes of training for some of the services like the Central Secretariat Training School which trains new recruits to the Central Secretarial Service. Systematic facilities for post-entry training do not exist for the Class II and subordinate services. Here the emphasis is on on-the-job informal training. However, some departments like the railways and posts and telegraphs run staff colleges to train their staff.

Various administrative bodies, however, regularly conduct refresher courses for public servants. The National Academy of Administration conducts refresher courses for officers of the IAS

with ten to fifteen years service. The refresher course is meant to impart specialised training in administrative thought and practice. Refresher courses for senior civil servants are also organised by the Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi. The training programmes conducted so far were on social welfare administration, development administration, financial administration, and problems of planning.

Young recruits to the Indian Civil, Police and Foreign Services get their initial on-probation training at the National Academy in Mussorie before proceeding to other specialised institutions to get their particular service-oriented training. An important consideration for introducing a common introductory five-month course in Mussorie for all civil service recruits was to enable them to have a knowledge of the political, constitutional, economic and social context in which the administration functions, besides acquainting themselves with the machinery of government and the broad principles of public administration. A new pattern of sandwich type of training was introduced for the IAS probationers at the National Academy in July 1969. Being problem-oriented the training is based largely on the experience and observations of the probationary IAS officers in the field of district administration during practical training in the states.

For top business and government executives, the Administrative Staff College, Hyderabad, provides a four-month course at the college. The objective of the Staff College is the development of executive and managerial capacities of the administrators, both in business and industry as well as in government. Training in the Police Services is conducted at the Police Training College for the IPS at Mount Abu. Similarly, many training schools have been set up in several states to train recruits to the higher levels of the state services.

It is thus obvious that in India, institutionalized training programmes have greatly expanded in number, scope and nature. Refresher and orientation courses, seminars, workshops and conferences form the major techniques of in-service training of civil servants. The central government grants study leave liberally (particularly to the scientific, technical and administrative staff) to enable them to undertake post-entry training in service.

Deficiencies

The major loophole in our training system of civil servants is the lack of a sound and integrated policy on employees' training. Training facilities are not equal in all government departments nor are they coordinated in a unified pattern. Lower level (Class II and subordinate services) employees rarely get systematic post-entry training. Another disturbing fact is that no class relationship exists between training and promotion, hence many employees are not often encouraged to undertake training. Flaws also exist in the content of the training courses.

which need to be modified in keeping with the advancement in modern administrative thought and practice as well as the changing socio-economic climate of the administration. Training of civil servants has been, till recently, a neglected aspect of personnel administration in India. It was only in 1968, a training division was established in the Ministry of Home Affairs to deal with training policies and programmes of the Government of India in the field of administration.

Training For Development Administrators in the Third World

Training is an action process, (a) by which capabilities of the personnel can be improved, (b) to meet the organisational needs in terms of their knowledge, skills, and attitudes required in performing organisational tasks and functions. Training may be viewed in terms of two broad categories. First, the routine training to administrators encompasses such tasks as record keeping, job analysis, job auditing and evaluation, organisation and method, office management, accounting, and time and motion studies. This type of training is primarily directed to routine and operational matters which are necessary for the continuous maintenance and servicing of the administrative machinery. The other category which we may call 'development training' is oriented to human resource development required for undertaking and managing government's development activities. Thus developmental training seems to require a new perspective and approach in formulating training needs and methods.

New developmental tasks have put tremendous pressure upon the existing administrative systems of Third World countries everywhere. Conceptualisation of government as a catalyst of social change and development makes it almost imperative to redefine the role and function of civil servants in society. Administrators will be required to engage themselves consciously and directly in the task of bringing about social change and development by initiating and implementing policies and decisions aiming at change and development. One of the consequences of such redefinition of the role of administrators will be to transform the administrator from a desk-worker to a field worker. Public officials now will have to assume such new roles as those of business executives, dispensers of social services, executors of economic policy, planners and industrial managers. Assumption of these new roles demands a fundamental change in the outlook/orientation, knowledge, skills and attitudes of the civil servants.[16]

Training Requirements

Knowledge : Development administrators in the Third World

16. Lulful Hoq Chowdhury, "Training for Development", *I.J. P.A.*, Vol. XXVI, 1980, pp. 378-383.

countries would have to initiate and operate development activities under multiple pressures and obstacles emanating from society. It is, therefore, necessary that development administrators are aware of the political, social, cultural and economic environmental constraints of the country in which they have to function. They must be acquainted with the social and cultural norms and values of the people they have to serve. Besides, the development administrator must have an accurate understanding of the general social structure, involving knowledge of sociological and economic relationships and principles. In short, a thorough study of the environmental setting in which he has to perform is required.

Skills : For development administrators general skills, usually provided through regular administrative training programmes, will not suffice. They would require skills in development programme and project formulation, implementation and evaluation. They should have ability to shape new courses and strategies as policy formulators. A pro-change policy formulator is actively engaged in formulating strategies and policies for making new changes for development. The development administrator must be good at immediate improvisation to become an effective crisis manager/administrator. He would require the ability to motivate others in accepting new changes and development. Also the development administrator needs to be an interest broker capable of choosing among competing interests and reconciling all parties to the outcome.

Attitudes/Values : In the new 'social service' and 'development' role, the civil servants must formulate and implement developmental works not as routine duty, but as social service meant to transform some aspect of national life. According to a thinker, development administrators to be effective and successful in undertaking and managing development programmes must acquire the attributes of an entrepreneur. An entrepreneur is one who is creative and result-oriented and does not hesitate to take calculated risks. It is essential that in training programmes due emphasis and encouragement is given to creativity and innovation.

Planned national development needs a greater degree of people's participation. The success of development programmes like integrated rural development programme, family planning programme, irrigation or rural works programme depends on people's acceptance, trust and confidence. Development administrators must consider it a part of development policy to make a consistent effort to educate and consult people and solicit their participation in developmental tasks. Development must be a cooperative endeavour of the people and their administrators.

Methods

Training methods would be as varied as the specific training

requires. In the context of development administration which requires fresh outlook and creative approach, case study method may be useful as a training device. Case study method is one that enhances a civil servant's comprehension and competence through the study of concrete cases. Lecture method coupled with debate and conference method may be used for transmitting information. Laboratory training (such as sensitivity training, T group training) may be utilised for creating awareness of self and social processes. Role playing has proved to be an effective technique for promoting attitudinal change. Problem solving and decision making workshops may be useful in increasing competence of civil servants in solving problems and in making effective decisions. Field exercises in the rural areas can also be a very useful training method.[17]

The content and techniques of training in any country cannot be static, but flexible and dynamic in character, changing according to the socio-economic conditions of society and the needs and aspirations of the people.

Promotion

A sound promotion system is of vital importance for the continued efficiency of the public services. Promotion in the words of Dr. White implies,

> An appointment from a given position to a position of higher grade, involving a change of duties to a more difficult type of work and greater responsibility accompanied by change of title and usually an increase in pay.[18]

Promotion is a reward to an employee which entails a change in his position and status. The promoted rises to a higher rank in the organizational hierarchy and pay scale which is often accompanied by additional responsibilities in the new post.

A system of graded promotions is essential to help build morale and efficiency in public services. Unless the civil service has adequate promotional avenues, it will not be able to attract ambitious and talented young men and women towards it as an attractive career. It may even frequently cause the more capable job aspirants to prefer employment in private enterprises. It deters employees from taking training courses and making other efforts towards self-improvement. A proper promotion system helps in retaining the services of the ablest amongst its employees and also in giving them an opportunity to improve their capabilities and qualifications. It is, thus, useful to the employees individually as well as to the administration as a whole.

17. United Nations, *Handbook of Training in the Public Service*, New York, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Public Administration Branch, 1966.
18. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, Macmillan, New York, 1958, p. 400.

But to improve the morale and efficiency of administration, a promotion system must be based on the principles of equity and fair play. Unjust prejudice, favouritism, corruption or bias on the part of promoting officers by pushing up unqualified employees are some hurdles in the way of establishment of a just and sound promotion system.

Essentials of a Promotion System

W.F. Willoughby lays down the following conditions as a basis of a promotion system:

1. Adoption of standard specifications setting forth the duties and qualifications required for all promotions in the government service.

2. The classification of these positions into district classes, series, grades and services.

3. The inclusion of all positions (except those of a policy making character) into this classification.

4. The adoption, so far as possible, of the principle of recruitment from within for filling up of higher posts.

5. The adoption of the principle of merit in determining the selection of employees for promotion.

6. The provision of adequate means for determining the relative merits of employees eligible for promotion.[19]

All types of civil services lay down certain eligibility criteria for promotion to all grades. Generally, there are two main forms of qualifications:

(a) Personal qualifications of the candidates, for example, educational standard, professional training or experience, or any specially laid down personal qualification, like physical fitness, social and other qualities.

(b) Service status is another relevant factor for determining eligibility for promotion. This refers to the range of selection of candidates for promotion. There are posts for which promotion is confined to a section or division or department, whereas there are others to which employees with requisite qualifications from other departments may also be eligible.

Principles of Selection for Promotion

There are two main principles on which the eligibility criteria for promotion can be fixed.

19. *ibid.*, p. 274.

1. The Seniority Principle : The seniority principle in government service is widely prevalent as a method of promotion in most countries.   According to Dr. Finer,

> It is automatic, and avoids the need for making invidious distinctions between one person and another, of placing the young over the old, of measuring the responsibility for the result of promotion.[20]

It is greatly followed in public service everywhere since it is objective, easy to follow, and gives every one a chance. It greatly eliminates chances of favouritism and corruption. It also reduces unhealthy rivalry or bitterness in the organisation thereby promoting harmony and increased morale in the services.

However, this system also has its flaws. In the first place, it does not necessarily lead to the selection of the best among those available and eligible for promotion. It also leads to demoralisation and complacency in service, among the more talented officials. This system, in fact, encourages only mediocrity. The principle may be successful for the lower posts but for the higher ones special types of qualities may be required.

2. Merit Principle : The merit principle requires that merit should be the sole basis of promotion. This ensures that the best person is promoted to the higher post 'based on specified criteria alone.' This would encourage hard work and efficiency, reward talent and increase morale in the services.

Methods of Testing Merit

(i) Personal judgement of the head : It is an old and respected principle that the departmental superior who is in close touch with the employees and is in the best position to know their administrative and personal qualities and potential as well as the requirements of higher posts, must be the best judge for assessing the eligibility of an employee's promotion. This also helps the departmental head to maintain discipline and authority in the department.

Criticism

But there have been many serious objections to this. Firstly, public organisations today are too vast and populous in nature making it impossible for all departmental heads to keep a close touch with their subordinates or to form an accurate opinion of their merits and capacities. Secondly, this system is greatly subjective making it susceptible to all kinds of pressures and prejudices. It often leads to unhealthy rivalry and causes considerable ill-will among those who may miss out for promotion.

20. Herman Finer, *Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, London, Methuen, 1954. p. 849.

Safeguards

(a) The adoption of promotion boards constituting many senior officials (instead of one departmental head) to assess the progress record of any employee. In some countries, it is within the purview of the Public Service Commissions to review all promotional cases at higher levels of the civil service and note all irregularities which can be reported to Parliament.

(b) In some countries, there is a system of appeal under which while the task of assessing the record of candidates for promotions has been left to the head of the department, a right of appeal to an agency outside the department has been given to the aggrieved party.

(c) In order to make the reports of the departmental heads more objective and systematic and to avoid as much subjectivity as possible, the assessment is made according to the prescribed forms which has specific categories like : (1) official conduct; (2) knowledge of branch or department; (3) initiative; and (4) power of taking responsibility. Grades like, 'well qualified' 'highly qualified'; 'not yet qualified' are given. Reasons have to be assigned for the reports marked 'exceptionally well qualified' or 'not yet qualified' by the rating officer.

(ii) Promotional examination : Some countries have examinations for promotions to senior grades of service. This system is generally followed at the lower levels of the public services. Promotional examinations may be competitive or qualifying in nature.

(iii) Efficiency rating : The system of efficiency rating originated in the USA for scientifically assessing the service record of public employees. It is based on two main factors, namely, the classification of all governmental posts and the mechanical evaluation of workers' qualities. It aims at assessing the different traits with a scientific accuracy and at solving all problems of promotional assessment. There are three methods of Efficiency Rating which are generally used separately or in combination.[21]   They are :

(a) Production records : The production records are generally used to assess work of a mechanical character such as those of typists, stenographers and machine operators. Production records when combined with records of a worker's personal traits, (punctuality, hard work etc.) may give an adequate picture of a worker's abilities.

(b) The graphic rating scale system : Assessment is based on certain categories or traits of an employee's character such as accuracy, industry, initiative, resourcefulness and dependability.

21.   A.R. Tyagi, *Public Administration, Principles and Practice*, pp. 502-504.

Each quality is graded into different classes like 'excellent', 'very good', 'satisfactory', 'unsatisfactory'. The entire scale gives a clear picture of a worker's ability and character.

(c) Personality inventory : The personality inventory includes a broad list of traits of human character relevant to employment. From these the rating officer has to select only those items which are relevant to the characteristics of the employee. However, the efficiency rating system has often been criticised for being too mechanical an attempt to categorise human character. Human character can hardly be analysed so scientifically and systematically and cannot be really open to laboratory experiment.

Performance Appraisal Process in India

Promotions to all high and middle government posts are made by the Union and State Governments, generally on the recommendations of the heads of departments, and often with the aid and advice of the state or Union Public Service Commission (in the case of the highest civil service posts). Confidential reports, which are filled up every six months, are the basis for promotion. In the confidential reports rating is done according to columns marked 'outstanding,' 'above average,' 'average,' 'below average,' and 'unsatisfactory'. Promotion in the public services in India is based on the seniority and/or merit principle. For selection posts (largely in class I and class II) the criterion of selection is merit. The officers considered for promotion are arranged in order of seniority, their number being limited to from three to five times the number of vacancies available for promotion. In the case of non-selection posts (Class III and IV) categories, promotion is made on the seniority principle, unless anyone is otherwise rejected or considered unfit. Generally, the basis of promotion has been seniority at lower levels, seniority-cum-merit at the middle ranks and merit at the senior grades of the civil service.

Suggestions for Improvement

(1) The system followed in the confidential reports on employees' performance should be remodelled to facilitate assessment of performance, personal qualities of workers and identification of the true potential of the candidates with as much objectivity as possible.

(2) The system is now too heavily loaded in favour of seniority rather than merit.

(3) Promotions should be linked to training and professional expertise and should ensure opportunities for growth and development in career.

(4) To avoid any kind of subjectivity, promotion boards should be established and take recourse to a system of appeals where

necessary. Qualifying and promotional examinations may be introduced for positions in the middle levels of the civil service.

According to may critics of the promotion system, promotions are made "within classes and often within cadres of a class. This may secure the rights of the civil servants but makes the higher public service more or less a closed shop."

Elaborating this point, Dr. Appleby writes,

The relatively small number who are promoted over class barriers is enough to enlarge the competition slightly, but it leaves original membership in a very great special advantage and competition from outside not highly significant.

This minimization of competition not only brings rigidity in administration but is, in his opinion, "the basic deterrent to rapid improvement of the administrative grasp of government responsibilities."[22]

Budget

The word 'budget' originally meant a bag, pouch or pocket attached to a person. In public administration the term refers to a financial document which is annually placed before the legislature, by the executive, giving a complete statement regarding the government revenues and expenditure of the past financial year and an estimate of the same for the next financial year. There is no unanimity among writers regarding the definition of the term 'budget'. It has been defined differently by different authors of public administration. The word has been used synonymously with 'programming' and 'management'. However, most people agree that the budget is the keystone of financial administration and the various operations in the field of public finance are correlated through the instrument of the budget.

A budget is a financial report of statement and proposals which are periodically placed before the legislature for its approval and sanction. A budget is a balanced estimate of expenditures and receipts for a given period of time. In the hands of the administrator the budget is a record of past performance, a method of current control, and a projection of future plans. It is a report of the entire financial operations of the government of the past (for a given period) and gives us a glimpse into future government fiscal policy. Budgeting aims to gather legislative support for government proposals. It is an attempt to allocate financial resources through political processes. It reflects an organization's goals and aspirations and its policies and proposals to realize them. "The real significance of the budget lies," states Willoughby, "in providing for the orderly administration of

22. Appleby, *Report of a Survey of Public Administration in India*, p. 28.

the financial affairs of a government." The entire budgetary process has been described by him in the following words:

> An estimate is first made of the expenditures that will be required, for the proper conduct of governmental affairs during a fixed period, usually one year, together with proposals for raising the money to meet these expenditures. On the basis of this estimate, revenue and appropriation acts are passed giving legal authority for the action determined upon. Following this, the operating services open revenue and appropriation accounts corresponding to the items of the revenue and appropriation acts, and proceed to expend the money so voted. The data recorded in these accounts are examined by the auditing and accounting department to ensure their accuracy, to see that they correspond to the real facts and represent a full compliance with all provisions of law. The information furnished by these accounts is then summarized and given publicity in the form of reports. Finally, on the basis of these data new estimates for the next year are made and the circuit is begun again. In this chain of operations the budget is the instrument through which several operations are correlated, compared and examined at one and the same time.[23]

The budgetary system that evolved in England during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, was viewed primarily as a legal and accounting instrument, and the budget agency had the main responsibility of consolidating money estimates of expenditure needs from the various departments each year. The conventional pattern of government budgeting serves the sole purpose of fiscal accountability and is merely a document for parliamentary control of the financial operations of the government. The entire expenditure is presented through a series of demands for grants. Every ministry presents one demand for its own requirements and separate demands for each of its subordinate organizations. The Demands for Grants, thus follow the organizational pattern and the details in each of these demands are on the basis of object-wise classification, for instance, establishment charges, contingencies equipment and materials. This type of budget is known as the line-item budget with its focus on itemized classification of expenditure.

The line item budget is effective from the viewpoint of public accountability, but today a budget has several other objectives. Viewed as an instrument of financial administration, budget is a vital tool of management. As an operational instrument, it is presented in the form of projects and programmes for which there

23. *The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, Vols. III and IV, Macmillan, 1968, p. 185-192.

is managerial responsibility in terms of achievement and costs in a given period. The government budget is also being used as an instrument for the analysis of government policy in financial administration. It can be used to review the pros and cons of the fiscal policy of the government which has an impact on the national economy as a whole. Through the budgetary process the government can influence levels of taxation, expenditure and capital investment consumption which practically affects all segments of the national economy and economic behaviour of the entire nation.

In developing countries which are committed to bring about rapid socio-economic progress and development of their peoples, the bureaucracy has by trial and error become the major instrument of implementation of public policy. Developmental goals like improving the level of social services, health and education, building infrastructure like roads, communication facilities, electricity and market centres or raising production in agriculture and industry incur much government expenditure. In the change-oriented milieu of development administration, a system of rigid checks and balances over financial administration may act as a deterrent to increased government spending which is vitally necessary to lay the foundations of a social welfare state. Too much stress on economy and accountability may make the administration tardy. Therefore, in the modern age, to suit the need of massive public investment and expenditure there is need for reforming the traditional concepts of accountability based budgeting. Elaborating the needs for reform in the budgetary system, specially in developing countries, Thavaraj writes,

> The need for result-oriented budgeting is more keenly felt in all the developing countries where investable resources are few, the backlog in development is considerable, entrepreneurship is scarce and consequently the role of the government is all pervading, embracing a wide variety of enterprises ranging from the simplest of consumer goods to the most complex capital goods industries and infrastructural facilities. Planning and budgeting are, therefore, extremely important to ensure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources .... Measurement of performance is an essential aspect of result-oriented budgeting.[24]

Most of the shortcomings of the line-item budget were sought to be removed by the performance budget, a new concept in financial administration which first originated and developed in the USA. Since 1950, the US government has adopted the

---

24. M.J.K. Thavaraj, "Performance Budgeting in India" in *Management in Government*, edited by B.C. Mathur and others, Publications Division, New Delhi, 1979. pp. 311-328;

performance budget. Several Third World countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America have also incorporated the principle of performance budgeting, partially if not totally, in their budgetary systems.

Features of a Performance Budget

Performance budgeting is a financial document that seeks the implementation and control of government programmes through budget allocation. This is done by presenting government operations in terms of programmes, activities and functions. Through such a functional classification of governmental financial operations, public policies are sought to be identified in the annual budget in concrete physical terms so that a direct interaction between inputs and outputs could be identified and state performance reviewed through clearly identifiable cost overheads. In traditional budgeting the objects of government expenditure, purpose of the different proposed outlays, or linkages between costs and performance cannot be clearly identified or assessed. In performance budgeting, the focus is on the end rather than the means. The main purpose is to clearly define the objects of governmental spending, the work to be performed and an estimated cost of the performance. The concept of a programme budget, which is also called a performance budget, sets in advance the targets and the authorizations against which the performance of the governmental departments can be assessed periodically. It serves as a basis for efficiency and work measurement qualitatively and quantitatively. The performance of the past year serves as a evaluation sheet for next year's budgetary targets and estimates. Performance budgeting shifts the emphasis from the means of achievement to the achievement itself, from what the government buys and acquires, to the service it renders.

The difference between a line-item budget and a programme budget has been aptly summarised in the following lines:

A line-item budget shows how many clerks will be hired, how much travel money will be spent, how much will go for printing or mimeographing, and what will be expended for papers, typewriters, and stationery. The plans are based on these line-items; the controls are geared to these lines; the information has to do with the things used. In sharp contrast, the programme budget starts with the work to be done, the costs of various work units, the purpose of travel, the ends to be served by printing or office supplies. The programme plans are in terms of the jobs to be accomplished; the controls are related to responsible management, the information tells what work is being or will be done in relation to what was authorised in the past.[25]

25. Modern Management for the City of New York (Vol. I), Report of the Mayor's Committee on Management Survey, pp. 102-103.

Processes of Performance Budgeting

A performance Budget is prepared in functional categories, such as agriculture, education, industry and health. Each functional category is divided into 'programmes', for instance, health may be divided into primary health, child health, and public health. Each programme is sub-divided into activities which in turn, are further divided into 'projects'. Activity constitutes the collection of similar types of work in a programme, the purpose of which is to contribute to the achievement of the latter, for example, training of primary rural health workers is an activity in the public health programme. 'Project' entails any activity which requires capital investment, such as building hospitals and health clinics. There are four main steps or phases of performance budgeting. They are: (i) compiling a functional classification of all governmental activities in the manner discussed above; (ii) evolving a system of fiscal management and cost reporting which may be in accordance with the objectives of a programme budget; (iii) developing accurate statistical weights and measures of assessing government performance in terms of adequacy and unit costs; and (iv) establishing in the budgetary processes, an objective system of performance evaluation to provide periodic feedback to executors of public policies.

The entire budgetary process of a programme budget entails certain basic steps.

The first step is to indicate the organisational structure of the agency and the objectives of that agency. The second step is to draw up a financial requirements table. The table, which seeks to make a tabular presentation of the budgetary needs of the organisations, contains three basic elements: (i) a programme and activity classification; (ii) object-wise classification showing the same expenditure divided into broad object-wise expenditure groupings, such as establishment charges, travel, grants-in-aid, etc; and (iii) sources of financing indicating the demand numbers and major heads under which these outlays are included in the current appropriation structure. The third step consists in providing an explanation of the financial requirements. This needs to be done with reference to each of the programmes included in the table. The purpose of this explanation is to provide some indicators that are capable of reflecting the performance aspects of the organisation.[26]

Merits of Performance Budgeting

Performance budgeting serves many useful purposes and

26. A. Prem Chand, *Performance Budgeting*, Academic Books, Bombay, 1969, p. 126.

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT   225

fulfils many shortcomings of the line-item budget. It is becoming increasingly popular as a tool of fiscal management and policy in modern financial administration. In the first place it makes it possible to establish identifiable linkages between policy and performance, inputs and outputs, the physical and financial aspects of governmental programmes and activities. Secondly, it would improve upon the budgetary processes and related fiscal policy-making coupled with the analysis of actual governmental performance. Thirdly, it would help to evolve a better system of financial accountability and legislative control. Fourthly, it would facilitate the processes of audit of governmental operations. Fifthly, it would make effective result-oriented assessment of the long-term development policies of the government. Sixthly, it would be the innovator of far-reaching reforms in financial administration. Seventhly, it would help eliminate waste, and inefficiency in the financial transactions of government, make budgets direction oriented and more development motivated. Lastly, it fixes responsibility very precisely besides giving a clear picture of revenue and expenditure alternatives.

Limitations and Difficulties

The adoption of performance budgeting imposes a lot of initial difficulties specially in countries where the traditional form of budgeting has been continuing for a long time. The major reasons for this are discussed as follows:

(a) The government performance is not always easily quantifiable and often may not have clearly visible results. In the absence of quantitative performance units an attempt to correlate plan programmes to budget heads often becomes a futile exercise, for example, law and order activity is a government activity whose 'result' or 'performance' cannot be very objectively measured.

(b) The difficulty relates to the lack of cost-accounts. Many assets of the government agencies cannot be accounted for in terms of unit costs.

(c) A problem in adopting the performance budgetary procedures is the arduous task of linking accounting heads with development heads. The difficulty arises due to the fact that the development heads such as agricultural production, education, and health are spread at different places in the departmental organization forming different major heads of accounts, with the result that it is very difficult to decipher the total expenditures on all the schemes under a development head. Therefore, it is often impossible to know what had been originally planned and their costs.

Performance Budgeting In India

In India, proposals in favour of performance budgeting

started originating in the mid-fifties. The Estimates Committee discussed budgetary reforms in its twentieth report and recommended the adoption of performance budgeting in India. It reiterated this recommendation again in its report in 1960.

Following the recommendations of the Administrative Reforms Commission in 1968, strongly urging the central and state governments to adopt this new form of budgeting, performance budgets of four central ministries were prepared that year. In 1977-78 about thirty-two developmental departments in the central government switched over to performance budgeting. Many state governments have also now introduced performance budgeting in selected departments.

However, the system of performance budgeting in India suffers from the same limitation discussed earlier (in the limitations of performance budgeting). Problems have arisen in the setting up of work units and in estimating costs. Regional diversities have resulted in different local precedents in costing procedures. In the absence of universal norms and standards of performance evaluation much of the benefits of this type of budgeting in terms of efficiency and performance are lost. In India, the achievement figures are often not quoted in concrete physical terms and the technique of cost measurement has not been followed right down to each cost centre. Targets and estimates are yet to be explained in terms of relevance and objectives as clearly as they should be.

To overcome these shortcomings a reorganization of the heads of accounts to bring them in line with the heads of development is first required.

A reform in the accounting system is also called for. A measure of rationalization of the administrative organisation of government ministries and departments will also facilitate the processes of performance budgeting. Lastly, a complete integration of planning and budgeting is imperative for a greater degree of success in the 'performance' of programme budgeting in India.

Coordination

Every organisation carries on its objectives with the help of various persons engaged in fulfilling the different tasks of the organisation. The diversity of tasks in the organisation necessitates division of work in accordance with the principles of division of labour. A government organization in every country is divided into a number of departments, services and agencies, which are further sub-divided into administrative units to facilitate work. In order to see that these various units, agencies and departments work in harmony with each other coordination becomes necessary. In the words of White, "Coordination is the adjustment of the functions of the parts to each other, and of the movement and operation of parts in tune so that each can make its maximum

contribution to the product of the whole." "Coordination", says Mooney, "is the orderly arrangement of group effort, to provide unity of action in the pursuit of a common purpose."

Coordination is needed for three main reasons :

(1) To prevent overlapping, conflict and constant inter-departmental friction. Inter-departmental disputes arise when two or more departments claim exclusive jurisdiction over a given matter or when a dispute occurs over matters in which a number of departments have legitimate interest but give contradictory decisions over it. Adoption of the uni-functional system of classification for government departments has also led to frequent frictions. Under this system, to build a house, the planning department will clear the site, the commerce department will supply material, the labour department will provide labour, while the housing department will construct the building. In such an arrangement the occurrence of inter-departmental disputes is scarcely surprising;

(2) To enable the employees to take a broad overview of administration instead of a narrow departmental one; and

(3) To see that the right people and right resources are available in the right quantity in the right circumstances at the right time.

Coordination is a necessary precondition of all successful management specially in government administration due to multiplication of the tasks of government organisations and its many agencies.

Coordination has both negative and positive connotations. Negatively, coordination means the removal of conflicts and over-lapping in administration; positively it means the fostering of a spirit of cooperation and camaraderie among the workers of an organisation. Newman defines coordination thus :

The orderly synchronization of efforts to provide the proper amount, timing and directing of execution resulting in harmonious and unified actions to a stated objective.[27]

According to Terry,

Coordination is the adjustment of the parts of each other and of the movement and operation of parts in time so that each can make its maximum contribution to the product of the whole.[28]

27. W.H. Newman, *Administrative Action*, Prentice Hall Inc., New York, 1953, p. 403.
28. G.R. Terry, *Principles of Management*, Richard D. Irwin Inc., Illinois, 1956, pp. 33-34.

To quote Mooney again,

Coordination is the first principle of organization and includes within itself all other principles which are subordinate to it and through which it operates.

Therefore, coordination entails the smooth and harmonious working of all parts of an organization as a whole, without conflict and overlapping to reach the desired goal in the minimum time with the maximum economy and efficiency.

Coordination can be of two types : (a) internal or functional which is concerned with the coordination of the activities of individuals working in an organization; and (b) external or structural which is concerned with coordinating the activities of various units of an organization. Both types of coordination is effected horizontally and perpendicularly. Horizontally, coordination establishes interrelation between one worker and another, beween one branch and another, between one section and another, between one division and/or one department and another. Perpendicularly, coordination is established between one employee and his officer, between officer and his next superior and so on and between one section and a branch, between a branch and a division and so on. In the words of Appleby,

Hierarchy functions both perpendicularly and horizontally. The horizontal relationship is between units and agencies commonly regarded as coordination in an effort to distinguish between coordination effected between units responsible to a single executive is coordination at the level of units, administration at the level of the executive to whom they are responsible, whereas he in turn participates in coordination with other agencies at his level.

According to Graves, essential factors in coordination are: (i) familiarity with the work of other agencies, (ii) informal acquaintance, (iii) physical proximity, (iv) a specific objective, (v) the desirability of a limited number of participants. Elbourne lays down six essential elements in the mechanism of coordination in a large organization : (1) coordinating personnel, (2) committees and conferences, (3) instructions, (4) reports and returns, (5) training, and (6) policy. Cooperation is the consequence of coordination.

Coordination is an administrative activity in which every employee is sometimes or the other involved, directly or indirectly. It is basically, a function of a general nature though it may be fulfilled by an amateur or a technician while performing a generalist role. Coordination may be on vertical or horizontal lines. In public organisations authority is always commensurate with responsibility. A rational balance between authority and

responsibility will help to preserve the functional equilibrium of an employee in the organisation. Coordination involves exercise of powers or authority by higher staff over the lower, and the proper discharge of responsibility by the lower staff. Coordination builds linkages across various levels of organization thereby affecting functional equilibrium in the organization as a whole.

Dimock states:

Once the goals of the programme have been set, its plans and policies determined, money provided, organization tailored to the need, personnel assigned, directions given, delegations determined and supervision provided for, then coordination is the means of bringing all of these factors together in an interlocking relationship, and control is the technique whereby all are checked and kept on the track toward the goals that were set in the first place. Coordination is the active means by which a blend is secured, control is the analytical method by which the blend is regularly tested and evaluated. Thus coordination and control close the circle in the administrative process.

MacFarland suggests four ways of achieving effective coordination. These are:

1. Clarifying authority and responsibility. This will reduce overlapping and duplication of work.

2. Checking and observation. It is also a control procedure whereby the executive can compare between actual activity and desired activity. Records and reports help the executive to detect the spots where inter-relations of the units are lacking.

3. Facilitating effective communication. Effective communication processes help in clarifying authority and observing the coordination which exists. The effective coordinating devices here are the use of committees and group decision-making techniques.

4. Coordination through leadership. Top administration must assert its leadership role and without this nothing of coordinative value will occur.[29]

The degree of effectiveness of coordination can be judged by the following criteria :

(1) It is timely and extends in a balanced fashion to all parts of the organization, and operates horizontally as well as vertically. Mary Parker Follett suggests: (a) It

29. Ordway Tead, *The Art of Administration*, McGraw Hill Co., New York, 1951, p. 192.

must be a continuous process; and (b) it must be direct between the persons immediately concerned;

(2)   It must start at the outset of the activity.

Difficulties in Coordination

There may be many hindrances to interdepartmental coordination. According to Gulick, some of these difficulties arise from (i) the uncertainty of the future regarding human behaviour as an individual and as a group, (ii) the lack of knowledge, experience, wisdom and character among leaders and their confused and conflicting ideas and objectives, (iii) the lack of administrative skill and technique, (iv) the vast number of variables involved and the incomplete human knowledge, particularly, about men and life, and (v) the lack of orderly methods regarding developing, considering, perfecting, and adopting new ideas and programmes.[30]

Seckler Hudson has added four more factors, namely, "size and complexity, personalities and political factors, the lack of leaders with wisdom and knowledge pertaining to public administration and the accelerated expansion of public administration of international dimensions."[31]   In short, the hindrances to coordination are the rapid proliferation of government departments and agencies, lack of delegation by the superior authority, and ambiguity in defining the span of control.

Means of Coordination

Co-ordination has to be effected at the level of policy, programmes as well as at the individual levels. There are both formal and informal means of achieving co-ordination. They are as follows :

(1) *Planning* :   To achieve success at efforts in co-ordination, effective planning of policies, programmes and employee tasks is essential beginning from the smallest to the biggest unit level. In large organizations a well chalked out plan decided beforehand will reveal the areas of overlapping, friction and duplication. In India, the Planning Commission acts as the chief co-ordinating agency.

(2) *Sound principles of organization* :   An organization established on sound principles of structure and function is an effective check against the evils that stem from a lack of co-ordination. An organization characterized by clear lines of authority, adequate powers, well understood allocation of function, absence of overlapping and duplication of effort and proper delegation of work in

30.   Gulick and Urwick, *Papers on the Science of Public Administration*, Columbia University Press. 1937, p. 40.

31.   Seckler Hudson, *Organisation and Management: Theory and Practice*, The American University Press, Washington, 1957, p. 53.

itself reduces the necessities of co-ordination.[32]

The Cabinet and Cabinet Secretariat

The task of co-ordination within the department is usually the function of the departmental head but matters of inter-departmental co-ordination are generally referred to the Cabinet. The Cabinet Secretariat in India which functions directly under the Prime Minister, has been co-ordinating the activities of the various ministries. It is entrusted with the task of general co-ordination of important administrative measures of the Government of India, which affect more than one ministry or when administrative disputes arise between the state and the central government. It is also responsible for co-ordination of all economic and statistical works of the Government of India.

Inter-departmental Committees ·

Inter-departmental conflicts are resolved by inter-departmental committees which may be composed of officials drawn from the top or middle levels of the departments concerned.

Regional Councils

Often regional councils representing different field organizations working in a particular region are instituted to co-ordinate the activities of these field organizations. These councils may serve a useful purpose by way of exchange of information and interpretation of policy and programmes, for co-ordinating the operations of services working in the same sphere. The Zonal Councils in India serve the above purpose.

Staff Agency

Staff officers and agencies may render all possible help to the line department by way of information and advice to help them in co-ordination and control of its activities. In India, staff agencies like the Civil Service Commissions, the O and M Division, and the Central Purchasing Agency are useful agencies of co-ordination.

Other Channels of Co-ordination

In India there are numerous organizational devices to bring about co-ordination. The Union Government and the Prime Minister's office are, above all, co-ordinating agencies. At the district level the Collector is, above all, a co-ordinator.

Co-ordination at the inter-organizational levels can be achieved through such devices like the inter-departmental committees, meetings and conferences among the officials of different

---

32. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, p. 214.

departments and by the appointment of centralized staff, auxiliary and financial agencies. Examples of these centralized agencies in India are the joint committees of the inter-related departments appointed from time to time, the Public Works Department, the Estate Office, the Directorate General of Supplies and Disposal, the Union Public Service Commission, the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, and the Ministry of Finance and its various departments.

Co-ordination at the national level or at inter-state levels in India is achieved through the Planning Commission, the National Development Council, conferences and meetings, and Zonal Councils. The Cabinet Secretariat, the Cabinet headed by the Prime Minister and various Cabinet Committees effect major co-ordination between the Centre and the states. The conferences of governors, chief ministers and ministers of different departments also help in co-ordination.

Besides, certain other boards and institutions like the University Grants Commission, the inter-university boards, the Indian Historical Records Commission, are also agencies which facilitate co-ordination. Lastly, the Finance Ministry in the Government of India which acts as a great co-ordinator. The Annual Budget itself is an essay in co-ordinating the resources, expenditures and programmes of the government and it is the task of this department to co-ordinate the claims and demands of the different ministries to evolve a national budget.

In addition to the formal means mentioned above, informal channels of communication like personal contacts, debates and discussions between officials often help in reaching agreements and smoothening conflicts which are invaluable for administrative co-ordination.

Delegation

Delegation means the entrusting of one's occupational authority to another, usually a subordinate, to facilitate work in the organization. The person to whom authority is delegated is normally a lower ranking employee who is accountable for the use of the delegated powers to the person who delegates them. Delegation of authority is a common feature in all types of large organizations. According to Mooney, delegation is the devolution of authority by a superior person to his agent or subordinate, subject to his supervision and control. This implies that legally the delegated powers still rest with the principal, to be exercised in practice by the subordinate or agent. Terry, however, disagrees with Mooney's interpretation of delegation. To him, "Delegation means conferring authority from one executive or organization unit to another."[33] Thus delegation does not necessarily imply

33.   James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organisation*, Harper and Row, New York, 1947, p. 17.

devolution from a higher to a lower authority. It can be vice versa or between units equal in status.

Delegation does not mean the final transfer of power and responsibility to the delegated authority. The person who delegates authority still retains the final power of supervision and control besides the powers to revoke his delegation any time he desires. Delegation of authority means more than simply assigning duties to others in more or less detail. The essence of delegation is to confer discretion upon others, to use their judgment in meeting specific problems within the framework of their duties. Thus *de jure* authority still belongs to the principal, but its *de facto* exercise is permitted to the person or agent to whom authority is delegated. In organizational terms, therefore, delegation is merely a device for division of authority.

An administrative thinker, M.P. Follett, states that the concept of delegation is a mere myth of organizational theory. She argues that delegation assumes that the chief or organizational head has the exclusive right to all authority, and that delegation is a functional necessity. Miss Follett, however, says that authority belongs to the job, and he who does it must have it whether his superior wants it or not. This means that authority goes with the job and does not necessarily has to be delegated. Delegation of authority is not discretionary, but compulsory for the functioning of the organization. Without denying this, however, it is possible to maintain that there is a distinction between delegation which is subject to supervision, and legally final transfer of authority, when it rests in the possessor in his own right (like decentralized authority). This distinction can be further elaborated in the words of S.S. Khera who has distinguished between delegation and decentralization in the following manner:

> I may define delegation as something limited to and by what is delegated. I distinguish it from decentralization, taking decentralization as something that includes what is delegated plus other things which are not delegated, but are mainly the consequences of the process of law. For instance, there is a decentralization of function, responsibility and authority under our Constitution. There is also a decentralization of function and authority and of resources, under statute law, under various laws passed by Parliament from time to time. When speaking of delegation, I do not refer to these at all, more particularly because such decentralised function, authority and responsibility do not yield as a necessary corollary that accountability which forms an essential feature of delegation as such.

Need for Delegation

Delegation is a functional imperative for all types of organizations. In fact it is inevitable for any group functioning which

necessitates division of work and authority. Delegation is one of the main ways of division of authority. The extent of delegation of authority, however, is inversely related to the size and diversity of work in the organization. According to White, "Circumstances of magnitude and volume, however, require some delegation of authority, and the settlement of much business at the point where it arises." The major advantages of delegation are the following:

1. Without delegating powers, where necessary, it would be physically impossible for the head to carry on the entire tasks of the organization himself. The chief executive or superior officers have to devote their time and energy to the most important executive and managerial tasks. Much of the routine tasks are performed by the lower staff who pass on the most important business to the chief executive. Delegation takes much of the weight of routine and unimportant work off the shoulders of the chief executive. Effective leadership is made possible only through the process of delegation. In the words of Mooney and Reiley,

> The real leader. . . finds it easy to delegate authority and is quick to do so whenever he perceives its necessity but he remains very conscious of the fact that there is one thing he cannot delegate, namely, his own authority and the responsibility which it includes.[34]

2. The avoidance of delay in administrative bottlenecks and convenience of citizens require decisions at various field offices rather than in a single headquarters establishment.

3. In some cases proper adjustment of policy and programme to local conditions requires discretionary field decisions.

4. One of the duties of a manager is to train and educate his subordinates in the art of sharing responsibility and making decisions which is possible only through delegation.' Delegation of authority therefore has much educative value. The subordinates develop greater loyalty and a sense of identification with the organization if they are made co-partners in the exercise of authority. This is a great morale booster to employees and provides sufficient incentive to work hard. Proper delegation of authority minimises delay, makes the organization more efficient, economical and operational.

Forms of Delegation

According to the degree of authority delegated, delegation may be (a) full or partial, (b) conditional or unconditional, (c) formal or informal, and (d) direct or intermediate.

34. James D. Mooney and Alan C. Reiley, *Onward Industry*, Harper and Row, New York, 1931, pp. 38-39.

(a) Delegation is full when complete authority is conferred on the agent, for example, when a diplomatic representative is sent abroad with "full powers" to negotiate. It is "partial" when he is required to get advice and guidance on crucial points from the head office at home.

(b) Delegation is conditional when the action of a subordinate is subject to confirmation and control by the principal, it is unconditional when the subordinate is free to act without reservations.

(c) Delegation is formal when embodied in written rules, and laws, it is informal when based on customs and conventions.

(d) Delegation is direct when no third person intervenes between the two parties to delegation; it is intermediate when it is made through a third person. Mooney gives two instances of such delegation. They are : the election of the US President by the people through an electoral college and the election of the Pope by the congregation through the Council of Cardinals.[35]

Hindrances to Delegation

Hindrances to delegation are of two types : (a) organizational, and (b) personal.

Organizational hindrances are :

(i) Lack of well established organizational methods and procedures.

(ii) Lack of means of co-ordination and communication.

(iii) Size and location of an organization—a widely spread out organizational network necessitates delegation.

(iv) Lack of properly defined duties and sphere of authority.

Pfiffner gives the following human causes of failure to delegate:

(1) Persons who rise to position of hierarchical leadership have more than normal egotism.

(2) They are afraid that others will not make the proper decisions or carry them out in the desired manner.

(3) They fear that disloyal or subversive power centres will develop among strong subordinates.

(4) Strong, vigorous, and highly motivated persons become impatient with the slower pace and indecisiveness of subordinates.

(5) In public administration, political considerations often make delegation difficult.

35. James D. Mooney, *The Principles of Organisation*, pp. 22-23.

(6) The cultural heritage of man has been one of authoritarian patriarchal leadership, thus, the practice of delegation is partly dependent on cultural change.

(7) The act of delegation requires an emotional maturity which apparently is rare, even among successful persons.

(8) The symbols of leadership (those personal qualities and traits which attract the attention of others) are inconsistent with the philosophy of delegation. Those striving to succeed must make themselves prominent.

(9) Persons who desire to delegate do not know how.

(10) They do not know how for, at least, two reasons :

   (1) the science of organization and management is immature; and

   (2) their work experience has not taught them to delegate because most organizations fail to practise delegation.[36]

Due to the overwhelming need and importance of delegation in modern day organizations, the abovementioned hindrances have to be removed and proper procedures and methods of work established to facilitate the processes of delegation. Every organization, big and small, should have clearly defined procedures, responsibility and hierarchically divided spheres of delegated authority to avoid confusion and duplication of work.

Proper means of co-ordination and communication between various levels of staff should also be established to facilitate the processes of delegation in organizations.

As far as personal factors are concerned, not only training of the subordinates but also of the senior administrators should be made compulsory. The subordinates should be trained in the art of proper use of discretionary authority and the higher levels of administrative hierarchy in the habit of delegation.

Essentials of Delegation

1. Delegation should be regarded as a whole at every point (including function, authority, power and responsibility).

2. Delegation must be sufficiently backed by resources; it must carry the weight and power of decision and resources.

3. Recognition of the fact that decisions cannot be made without the risk of error.

4. There should be mutual trust among the two parties involved.

36. Pfiffner and Presthus, *Public Administration*, p. 216.

5. Delegation must be clear and equivocal.

6. A corollary of delegation is accountability.

General Principles of Delegation

1. Delegation should be written and specific.

2. Authority and responsibility for each position in the organizational hierarchy should be clearly spelled out and delegation should be made to an ex-officio authority, not to an individual.

3. Only that much of authority should be delegated as is within the competence of subordinates to exercise safely.

4. Delegation should be properly planned and systematically exercised.

5. A systematic reporting system should be established with those to whom the authority has been delegated.

Herman and Zelda Roodman suggest three methods of delegation. These are :

1. *Assignment review* : The subordinate is asked to write a precise summary of the task allocated, before he actually starts the course of action to be followed.

2. *Indirect participation* : The superior periodically questions the subordinates concerning the progress of the task to determine the problem areas.

3. *Written reports* : Writing reports requires a special ability on the part of subordinates to inform the management concerning the results of their research in investigation of the problem.[37]

Limits of Delegation

1. The extent to which authority may be delegated is restricted by constitution, laws and political institutions.

2. The ability and competence of staff at the lower level.

3. The extent to which special programme requirements necessitate centralization.

4. The nature of work and the size and extent of an oraganization.

5. Degree and system of internal communication in the organization.

6. The degree of co-ordination which is required throughout the organization.

37. Herman and Zelda Roodman, *Management by Communication*, Methuen Publications, Canada, 1973, p. 104.

There are also other limits to delegation. However, the following powers are not usually delegated.

1.   General financial supervision and the power to sanction expenditure above a specified amount.

2.   Appointment and rule making power in the organization.

3.   Power to sanction new policies and plans and departures from established policy or precedents.

The degree to which delegation is possible varies from case to case depending upon the nature of the case, the circumstances and the responsibilities involved. Retention of the above powers in the hands of the head is necessary for effective control of an organization.

An effective system of delegation is one in which:

1.   The managers as well as the employees of an organization understand the value and advantages of delegation.

2.   The abilities and talents of employees at all levels are used in the right degree.

3.   Achievement standards for jobs to be performed for delegated authority are clearly laid down.

4.   An adequate system of employee education and training exists.

5.   There is close co-operation between the manager and the subordinate, the former helping the latter where required.

6.   The worker is permitted maximum freedom to reach his goals without interference but within the specified period.

On the recommendation of the O and M Division, the Central Government has already taken to "delegation" in administration as a matter of policy. The Finance Ministry's control over expenditure has been considerably reduced by the delegation of financial powers to various ministries and departments. The Administrative Reforms Commission has in its final report on 'Delegation of Financial and Administrative Powers' recommended that based on trust, the delegation of powers should be to the 'maximum possible' and not 'minimum necessary' and may be subjected to periodic review to keep in tune with the changing needs of administrative practice.

Decentralization

One of the major problems of modern administration is to reconcile the compulsions of national integration, unified planning and the need for a strong and effective defence that pull in the direction of centralization, with the growing demand for regional

autonomy and political commitment to take democracy to the grassroots, which pull in the opposite direction. Other factors which strengthen the case for centralization are vastness of the geographical area of many states, huge population and the increasing scope of state activity, which often necessitates a great degree of centralization and concentration of powers in the hands of the central government. Centralization stands for concentration of authority at, or near the top of the administrative hierarchy, decentralization, on the other hand, means devolution of powers from above, implying dispersal of power among a number of subordinate officials or administrative units. Decentralization may have different implications to different sets of people.

> To an economist it means dispersal of industries; to advocates of local authority it implies initiative, responsibility and discretion to local bodies, and to an administrator it means delegation of authority to regional and local officers.[38]

Decentralization should be distinguished from delegation. Decentralization means the transfer of administrative authority from the centre to the local agencies, who function autonomously in the field. Delegation, on the contrary, implies devolution of authority by a person to his agent or subordinate subject to his right of supervision and control. In brief, delegation is distribution of power of functions and not authority and responsibility, which is delegated only in decentralization.

Types

Decentralized agencies can be of various types depending upon their legal status, responsibilities, authority and accountability. Decentralization may be political or administrative. Political decentralization implies the setting up of new levels of government. The creation of autonomous states within the Indian Union and of Panchayati Raj institutions within the states are examples of political decentralization. Administrative decentralization may be vertical and territorial, or horizontal and functional. The former implies the higher agency or authority establishing area administrations and entrusting them with autonomous power and functions. Government departments, both at the Centre and States, have their own administrative areas known as circles, zones and districts vested with decision making authority within prescribed limits. Territorial decentralization thus involves the problem of relationship between the headquarters and numerous field agencies. Functional decentralization signifies the central authority ceding specified decision making functions to technical or professional bodies or experts. Universities, All India Medical Council, Bar

38. P. Sharan, *Modern Public Administration*, Meenakshi Prakashan, Meerut, 1981, p. 437.

Association, University Grants Commission, Central Social Welfare Board are examples of functional decentralization.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Decentralization

Decentralization has many advantages from the viewpoint of providing service to the local people and developing progressive and responsible attitudes at all levels of the organizational hierarchy. Since decentralization is the opposite of centralization, the vices of the latter may be regarded as the virtues of the former. The two main defects of centralization are:

(i) remoteness of control resulting from loss of contact with local centres; and

(ii) top heavy management or overload of work at the Centre. Besides, other advantages of decentralization are:

(1) It helps in the extension of popular control over a large number of functions which may be delegated to the authorities at field offices or at the lower levels.

(2) It facilitates the adjustment of national policies to the distinctive features of socio-cultural and economic conditions and characteristics.

(3) Dispersal of authority and devolution of real powers to local units encourages speedy disposal of cases, reduces delays and short circuits red-tape.

(4) Decentralization brings administration closer to the people, thereby encouraging popular participation in administration since public cooperation is solicited at all levels.

To the above points, we may add the following by Charlesworth:[39]

(i) It facilitates experiment, without committing the whole enterprise to an untried course of action.

(ii) It encourages competition and comparative standards of evaluation among several competing field units.

(iii) It helps develop initiative, responsibility and resourcefulness among both the local people and subordinate administrators working in field offices.

Decentralization is, however, not free from operational defects and difficulties. The positive arguments in favour of centralization may be stated thus : (1). Adoption of a planned economy has become a compulsion in most states developed or developing. Integration has obvious advantages for planning.

39. J.C. Charlesworth, *Governmental Administration*, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1951, p. 207.

A countrywide plan prepared by the Centre to be implemented in different states requires coordination and integration between the Centre and the states. (2) Centralization reduces conflicts and overlapping jurisdictions.

Operational difficulties in the way of decentralization are: (i) the influence of local pressure groups upon decentralized units, (ii) the difficulty of coordinating decentralised functions, (iii) the problem of delimiting geographical jurisdictions, and (iv) decentralization, particularly in the present day world, has important limitations since policy in regard to defence, foreign affairs, communications and planning has to be formulated, integrated, coordinated and executed by a strong national government in all states.

Centralization and decentralization are not axiomatic principles of administration which can be universally applied to all types of administrations: they have a contextual relevance. According to James W. Fesler, there are four factors which are relevant in opting for a centralized or decentralized system. These are responsibility, administration, function, and external factors.[40]

Since authority and responsibility go hand in hand in public administration and as long as the central authority is held ultimately responsible for any action, it is often unwilling and reluctant to delegate discretionary authority to field offices. Among the administrative factors, mentioned by Fesler, are "age of the agency, stability of its policies and methods, competence of its field personnel, pressure for speed and economy, and administrative sophistication. The main functional factors may be the variety of functions an agency performs, the technical nature of functions, and the need for nationwide uniformity. It is common experience that while certain types of functions like defence, planning, communications etc. pull in the direction of centralization, operating decisions can be easily decentralized at the appropriate lowest units. Among the external factors may be included the demand for popular participation in programmes and the pressure of political parties for operationalizing the concept of grassroots democracy and 'planning from below' in many states.

Decentralization for Development

One of the oft-recurring debates in the developing countries centres around the degree of control that central governments can and should have over development planning and administration. The centralization versus decentralization debate has been more insistent in the wake of new shifts in the development

---

40. F.M. Marx, *Elements of Public Administration*, pp. 251-258.

strategy of Third World countries. Since the early fifties, the general trend was towards centralized planning and development efforts to achieve socio-economic goals. Central planning was introduced in most developing countries in the 1950s as a means of optimum utilisation of scarce national resources to achieve rapid growth. Under tight central control capital intensive industrialization policies, that were aimed at maximising gains in national income, were advocated by economic development theorists during the 50's and 60's. The benefits of such centralized planning and industrialization, it was felt, would "trickle down" and spread throughout the length and breadth of the developed societies, alleviating poverty and pushing the countries into a stage of self-sustaining economic growth. Central planning and administration were considered necessary to guide and control the economy and to unify and integrate the newly independent countries, emerging from long periods of colonial rule. Moreover, central control was implicit in the requirements of the international assistance agencies which were providing large amounts of capital during the 1950's and 1960's to these countries. These agencies gave aid on the understanding that borrowers would undertake comprehensive and long term plans for the investment of external capital.

However, by the end of the 1960's there was widespread disillusionment with centralized models of growth in developing countries. Sluggish economic growth coupled with widespread income and regional disparities were rampant in these societies. Many development planners and administrators, therefore, started questioning the very rationale behind these concepts of development.

Governments of developing countries started giving much more attention to providing for the basic needs of the poor and underprivileged, to see that economic growth was coupled with relative social equity. During the seventies many governments in Asia, Latin America and Africa began experimenting not only with new approaches to economic and social development, but also with new political and administrative arrangements for implementing development programmes and projects. The increasing interest in decentralization arose from three converging factors discussed earlier.

First, it emerged from disillusionment with the results of highly centralized planning and control of development activities during the 1950's and 1960's. Second, it arose from the implicit requirements in the growth—with equity policies of the 1970's for new ways of managing social development progrommes. Finally, it evolved from the growing realization among policy analysts during the early 1980's that as societies become more complex and government activities expand, it would be increasingly difficult to plan and

administer all development activities effectively and efficiently from the centre.[41]

Advocates of decentralization have offered a long list of reasons for transferring more responsibility for development planning and administration to local governments, voluntary organizations, and regional authorities. Rondinelli has identified the variety of arguments that have been made in favour of decentralization.[42]

1. Decentralization can be a means of overcoming the severe limitations of centrally controlled national planning by delegating greater authority for development planning, and management, to field officials, who are closer to the local people and their problems. It will allow them to tailor development plans and programmes to the needs of heterogeneous regions and groups.

2. Decentralization can cut through the enormous amount of red-tape and rigid rules and regulations characteristic of centralized planning and administration.

3. It will lead to closer citizen-administration contacts leading to greater public participation in administration.

4. Decentralization could also allow better political and administrative penetration of national policies into remote areas, where central government plans are often unknown or ignored or undermined by local elite.

5. Greater representation for various religious, ethnic, political or tribal groups in development decision making could lead to greater equity in the allocation of government resources and investments.

6. It would lead to the development of greater administrative capacity among local governments and private institutions in the regions and provinces.

7. Decentralization can lead to more flexible, innovative, and creative administration. Regional, provincial or district administrative units may have greater opportunities to test innovations and to experiment with new policies and programmes in selected areas without having to justify them for the whole country. If the experiments fail, their impacts are limited to small jurisdictions, if they succeed, they can be repeated in other areas also.

8. By reducing diseconomies of scale inherent in the over-concentration of decision-making in the national capital, decentralization can increase the number of public goods and services— and the efficiency with which they are delivered at lower cost.

41. Dennis A. Rondinelli and G. Shabbir Cheema, *Decentralization and Development*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1983, p. 10.
42. *ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

9. Decentralization allows local leaders to locate services and facilities more effectively within their communities, to integrate isolated or backward areas into regional economies, and to monitor and evaluate the implementation of development projects more effectively than can be done by central planning agencies.

10. It can increase political stability and national unity by giving groups in different sections of the country the ability to participate more directly in development decision making, thereby increasing their "stake in maintaining the political system."

Democratic Decentralization in India

The proposal for democratic decentralization in India was first mooted in the report of Balwant Rai Mehta study team in 1957 recommending a three-tier system of rural local government, called the Panchayati Raj, in India. The principal thrust of the report was towards decentralization of democratic institutions in an effort to shift decision centres closer to the people, to enable their participation, and to put the bureaucracy under local popular control. The uniqueness of Panchayati Raj institutions was to lie in their development orientation in the specific context of planned economic change as also in their treating the elected representatives of the people as the motivating power and instrument behind this development. Democratic decentralization implies people's right to initiate their own projects for local well-being and the power to execute and operate them in an autonomous manner.

The term Panchayati Raj refers to a three-tier structure of rural local self-government in each district. It calls for a transfer of responsibility for much of rural development administration to these local authorities. Each state in India was asked to evolve a system of Panchayati Raj keeping in mind the principles laid down by the Balwant Rai Mehta study team. Most of the states have a three-tier structure of the Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat at the village level, the Panchayat Samiti at the block level and Zila Parishad at the district level.

In 1958, the National Development Council of the Government of India while endorsing the proposals for democratic decentralization stressed the following principles:

1. There should be a three-tier structure of local self-governing bodies from village to district levels, with an organic link from the lower to the higher ones.

2. There should be a genuine transfer of power and responsibility to these bodies.

3. Adequate financial resources should be transferred to these bodies to enable them to discharge the responsibilities.

4. All development programmes at these levels should be channelled through these bodies.

5.   The system evolved should be such as to facilitate further decentralization of power and responsibility in future.

The significance of these institutions lay in the fact that the motive force for development was to come from the people themselves, the state assisting with supplies, services and credit. The cooperative principle was to be applied infinitely to solve all problems of rural life.

Panchayati Raj is now operating in most of the states in India. However, the existing local institutions are not in a position to show a satisfactory record due to limitations under which they have been working. The varied administrative problems of democratic decentralization may be summarised as follows:

1.   Whether and to what extent should the 'deliberative', and 'executive' functions be combined in the hands of the Panchayati Raj bodies. If only policy making functions are entrusted to the elected bodies, as in a parliamentary government, the important purpose of organising the community for effective action and getting from the people maximum contribution in resources, voluntary labour and enthusiasm, for the tasks of development would not be achieved.

2. While imbibing some of the virtues of bureaucratic administration like impartiality, objectivity and non-political character, the chances are that it will imbibe some of the weaknesses too of the existing administrative culture.

3.   The role of the government functionaries will be affected. Some of them will gradually get converted into employees of the local authorities.

4.   The problem of 'politicisation', the high degree of illiteracy, caste and communal factions leave little scope for emergence of healthy leadership in the Panchayati Raj bodies.

5.   Problems of inter-relationships between the different levels of government, the Village Panchayat, the Panchayat Samiti, the Zila Parishad, district administration and state government will arise from time to time.

6.   New technologies discovered have led critics to state that the efficient use of modern technology cannot be ensured through small administrative units, for instance, new varieties of wheat had been discovered making way for what came to be known as the 'green revolution' in India.   From then on a distinct technological orientation began to be given to agriculture inducing the central government to make direct inroads into agricultural planning and development bypassing both the state and local governments.

The present practice of the central government is to use its own bureaucracy for the transfer of technology in rural areas, or

administration of special rural oriented programmes, ignoring popular institutions. This has been greatly welcomed by the administrative elite who were in any case not kindly disposed towards Panchayati Raj bodies which they felt, provided an opportunity for grassroots politicians to interfere in the affairs of the bureaucracy.

All these factors, have cumulatively resulted in a low-profile Panchayati Raj since the mid-sixties. The Indian political system had started displaying markedly centralizing tendencies from around the same time the pace of which got further accelerated since 1971 due to various reasons. This exactly was not the climate under which Panchayati Raj could grow and flourish and it is scarcely surprising that most Panchayati Raj bodies are now languishing for lack of funds or sheer neglect.

Issues in Field-Headquarters Relationship

The term 'headquarters', refers to the centrally located chief directing and supervising office of government establishments in contrast to regional or field offices spread out in different areas of the country. In the Indian administrative system, 'headquarters' means the secretariat, and the term 'field' refers to attached and subordinate offices. Though much of the important business of the government is carried out in the headquarters, about seventy-five per cent of the administrative work in all countries is actually carried out in the numerous field offices under the various departments of the national and state governments at the regional, state, divisional, district and lower levels. For, it is in the field that taxes are collected, laws are enforced and welfare services of the government are rendered to the people.

The vastness of the size and area of some modern states, the tremendous expansion of the welfare functions of government, improvement in the field of transportation and communication leading to greater headquarters-field contact, and the general trend towards democratic and decentralized administration have all led to the tremendous importance and expansion of field establishments in every administration of the world.

There are two major issues involved in the headquarters-field relationship : (i) territorial-functional dichotomy, and (ii) communications and control.

Territorial-Functional Dichotomy

The organizational pattern of field offices from the angle of supervision, direction and control can be of two types—territorial or functional. Willoughby has called them unitary or multiple. In the territorial unitary type, the central headquarters establishes regional territorial offices which are entrusted with supervisory

and discretionary administrative functions over the whole area. The officer in charge of the regional office is the head of the administrative hierarchy of the same office and heads of all other specialized units at that level are his subordinates. He is the main medium of communication between the headquarters and the field office and owes responsibility to the central office alone for all acts committed by the officials working under him. In the multiple or functional form, the different divisions or branches of the headquarters office have their corresponding field establishments at different regional levels and maintain direct contact with them. There is no coordinating or integrating officer or agency at the area level, each service or agency is considered autonomous in its own sphere, the line of authority running directly from it to its headquarters counterpart. The main difference between the two systems is that while in the unitary system the head of the station is "the general manager of the station in the fullest acceptance of the term"; in the multiple system, "the station is looked upon as an assembly of units which are only loosely held together for matters of general administration by the authority of the head of the station."[43]

In the unitary system there is unity of command and it establishes supremacy of generalists over specialists in administration. Its main advantages are:

1. It is truly a decentralized system which tends to give maximum powers to the field rather than concentrate authority at the top.

2. It allows much flexibility in management of regional problems and affairs to the area head who can make any modification and procedural change suiting his area needs without affecting the entire agency work.

3. It ensures sufficient independence and autonomy to each division of the field office from its central counterpart allowing initiative and responsibility to develop among field administrators.

4. It is very useful for departments whose functions are varied in nature and scope.

A good example of the territorial unitary type of field organization is the prefectural system in France. As head of the department (the largest unit of local administration) and also as a central government agent, the prefect has a dual role to play in administrative affairs.

The various services in the field of a Department (Province) are under the prefect and the various departments of the central

43. W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration*, p. 139.

government deal with them through that officer. In India, the collector of the district also exercises almost similar functions as that of a prefect in France.

In the functional or multiple system, each functional unit is directly connected with its central counterpart, the station chief being responsible only for the minimum establishment duties of the station. It is a system of "dual command", as under it area functional experts or technical personnel take orders from both the station officer and the functional counterparts at the central office (headquarters). The main advantage of this system is that technical operations in field offices come under the direct control and direction of the central experts.

The pattern of central control over field offices has been described by Luther Gulick who discovers three patterns of field organization, namely : (i) All fingers, (ii) Short arms, long fingers and (iii) Long arms, short fingers. Under the first pattern the headquarters office deals directly with the field stations without the intervention of any regional sub-divisions anywhere. In the second type, there are geographical divisions, but they are located in the headquarters office itself and not in the field, for example, in the External Affairs Ministry in India. It has no less than hundred sections, administrative, territorial and technical. These are grouped into a dozen divisions such as the American Division, Western Division, Southern Division, Protocol Division and External Publicity Division. Under the third pattern, there are geographical divisions and sub-divisions, located in the field away from the headquarters, for example, divisional and district offices in the states in India.

The pattern of headquarters-field relationship are of principally two types. The first relates to a single governmental programme with headquarters office in the capital, and a sub-structure in the field which may include regional, state and local offices at one or more of these levels or all of them in combination. In the second type of arrangement a number of different governments at different levels coordinately occupy themselves with a particular type of programme, as the case of public health for example. In the first arrangement, relationships are vertical and occur within the same federal agency. In the second, they are both vertical and lateral because they occur in a line from the central to related agencies of different governments at different levels (federal, state and local) and also between federal field units and agencies of other governments at the same level.

Field establishments are to be found both in centralized and decentralised administrative units. Under a centralised system the field offices are merely executing agencies; and their internal organisation as well as working are wholly controlled by the central organisation. Under a decentralized system, the field

offices work under a general grant of authority, and in most matters their decisions are final, except in cases for which there is provision for an appeal or review by the central office.

Communication and Control

Establishment of a system of good and effective headquarters-field relationship depends to a great extent on smooth and effective channels of communication between them. Very often the non-fulfilment of tasks and functions entrusted to field agencies is due to lack of understanding and effective communication between the central and the field office. The communication often takes a one way form, that is, from top to bottom in the form of directives, orders and circulars.

Notings on files and office manuals are also other channels of communication. In India there is very little feedback from below (field offices to headquarters), a situation which needs to be remedied. If proper performance of duties by the field officials is to be ensured a more adequate system of communication from top to bottom and vice versa is to be encouraged.

Another issue of field-headquarters relationship which is of importance is the need for an effective system of control over the field establishments. There are three main methods of headquarters control over field establishments.

1. Advance review : Prior referring of matters to headquarters for decision. Thus the central office gets full control over all major decisions regarding budget, matters, and managerial problems by the system of advance reviews.

2. Accounts and reporting : One of the usual methods of exercising control over subordinate offices is for the headquarters to insist on receiving information from the field agencies in the form of returns, reports and statistics relating to the progress of field operations.

3. Audit and inspection : This is a very important method of examining compliance with rules and regulations in financial dealings to check unauthorized or any kind of excess or illegal expenditure.

Periodic inspection by headquarters staff is meant to ensure that the existing office rules, regulations and procedures are observed. Besides ensuring compliance with instructions, it examines the legality of all administrative transactions in field offices.

Measures to Strengthen Field-headquarters Relationship

For the smooth and effective functioning of field establishments and the removal of all major irritants in headquarters-field

relationships, the following prerequisites are required:

1. The powers, authority and responsibility of field officers should be clearly delimited, and contingency powers clearly defined, coupled with considerable autonomy given in local matters to field offices.

2. Communication between headquarters and field offices should be two-way, from top to bottom and vice-versa.

3. There should be an adequate system of training for field personnel to make them more prepared for their tasks in the field.

4. Periodic transfers from field to headquarters and vice versa are imperative to inculcate a balanced outlook on local requirements and national policies.

5. Formal inspections, submissions of periodic reviews and reports should be supplemented by informal visits of headquarters staff to build up rapport and camaraderie between the headquarters and field.

Organisation of Field Offices in India

Where the implementation of the central government policies require devolution of executive powers and the setting up of field establishments for purposes of regulation, execution or control, a ministry has under it subordinate field stations which are known as attached and subordinate offices. The attached offices are responsible for providing executive direction in the implementation of policies and programmes of the ministry to which they are affiliated. They also provide necessary technical information and advice to the ministry on technical problems and issues arising under their jurisdiction. The subordinate offices function as field establishments or as agencies responsible for the detailed execution of government decisions. They normally function under the supervision of an attached office, or directly under a ministry. The pattern of important attached and subordinate offices working under two major central government ministries are illustrated below.

Ministry of Finance

The important attached offices of this ministry are : (i) Office of the National Savings Commissioner, (ii) Indian Security Press, (iii) Government of India Mints, (iv) Silver Refinery Project Calcutta, and (v) Directorate of Inspection. The subordinate offices of the ministry include : (i) Office of the Regional Director of Companies, (ii) Offices of the Registrar of Companies at a number of places, (iii) Collectors of Customs at ports, (iv) Collectors of Central Excise, and (v) Income Tax Department.

Ministries of Transport and Communication

Besides the main subordinate offices, that is, Meteorological Department and Railway Inspectorate, the Department of Posts and Telegraphs has a network of post and telegraph offices spread through the length and breadth of the country. These may be classified into : (a) regional offices, (b) head offices in big cities, (c) branch offices, and (d) sub-branch offices.

At the state level there are field offices above the district offices at the divisional or regional level under the various departments such as police, education, health, and cooperative societies. The most important field office at the district level is that of the District Collector. The district officer system symbolizes the concentration of central government powers in the regional representative, making him the chief agent of coordination and direction in the field and the main channel of communication between technical field officials and headquarters staff.

8

ADMINISTRATION AND PEOPLE

Criteria of Successful Administration

The importance of public administration has been steadily increasing with the gradual expansion of state activity in modern times. Public administration is now an all encompassing factor of the daily life of the individual as well as the community, which has seen the emergence of what has now been labelled the "Administrative State". The functions of public administration have shown a universal trend of expansion everywhere, whether in the capitalist United States, the communist Soviet Union or the developing countries of the Third World. The early liberal notion of a *leissez faire* state which was to be responsible only for the maintenance of law and order (i.e. philosophy of minimum state intervention in the daily life of the individual and community) has become totally outmoded and irrelevant today. The modern state has undertaken the new role of accelerator of economic and social change as well as the major responsibility for providing modern amenities of life, education, health, improved means of transport and wider opportunities for employment to its citizens.

The major factors which have led to the great expansion of state functions are, firstly, the rise of industrialization and the resulting growth of urbanization; secondly, change in the political philosophy of the state (from individualism to social welfarism); thirdly, the two world wars and the resulting international situation which has also tended to largely increase the functions of the state. The fourth important factor is the vast increase in the population of most of the countries which has immensely complicated the problem of providing food, shelter and other necessities of life to their citizens. This has led to the adoption of planning on the part of many states to solve the ever growing problems of administration. These factors taken together led to the emergence of what is called the Great Society, which in turn contributed to the establishment of 'Big Government' in almost

every advancing country. Big Government, in the words of F.M. Marx requires a large apparatus to carry on its many functions. Public administration, therefore, seeks to achieve new and positive objectives. The fundamental principles of the welfare state have greatly transformed the work of public administration, with the result that the older regulatory functions have become much less prominent and the newly created departments for rendering various social services as well as for pursuing development and research have assumed greater importance.

Gladden lays down three general characteristics of an efficient system of public administration:

(1) It must be capable of meeting the functional aims for which it has been brought into being.

(2) It must be able to meet the long term changes postulated both by the alterations in the social environment and by the general development of administrative technique.

(3) It must, while conforming to a centralized plan, be capable of meeting the various special demands of the separate departmental units.[1]

Apart from efficiency and integrity the administrator needs to have a human approach to all problems and programmes that he has to solve and implement. This implies that he must have the spirit of service to the community which is absolutely essential in democracies. Also (1) he should possess a broad outlook on public affairs; (2) his only aim should be to help the public rather than get bogged down with a rigid and mechanical implementation of rules and regulations; (3) he should have the capacity to judge upon relevant advice and take decisions promptly; and (4) when a decision has been taken, the administrator should inspire and motivate his staff at all ranks to execute it effectively. Every successful administration should be result-oriented, speedy and prompt in meeting the demands of the public. What is needed is not a 'procedure-oriented' bureaucracy, but a more 'performance oriented' one.

Today public administration relates to the whole of society and the political economy. Thus assuming its overwhelming importance, the question may now be asked : What is the criteria of successful administration ? What is the ideal administrator supposed to do to achieve success in his job ? The answer depends on the norms we lay down for judging the success or measuring the worth of any administrative system. The norms of an administrative system are both old and new. Traditional norms— efficiency, economy, good management and public interest are well

1. E.N. Gladden, *The Civil Service*, Staples, London, 1956, pp. 123-124.

established measures of judging the success of any administrative system. To these old ones can be added : socio-economic progress, equality and justice. Inequality among men and nations has been one of the most critical social, economic and political characteristic of our time. Widespread inequalities provide the breeding ground for social fermentation, dissent and alienation. A public administration which accelerates these problems or does nothing to ameliorate them will be unpopular and shortsighted in approach. A vigorous goal oriented and dynamic administration catering to required social change corresponds to the present climate. Fundamental to this concept of administration is the premise that administration must be value-oriented and not value neutral, since value neutrality is neither probable nor desirable in existing class divided societies.

In most democratic countries the government represents the people's choice and administration becomes an instrument for the welfare and service to the people. The twin pillars of democracy are liberty and equality hence the measure of successful administration is to be judged by the extent to which the administration has served these goals.

The public administrators in all countries should accept their role as servants of the public devoted to the realization of public interests and general well being. Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleveland state that:[2]

(i)   The future administrator will be more of a moral leader, mediator and coordinator than mere issuer of orders;

(ii)   he will learn to be a tactician and politician as he will be subject to vastly increased political pressures; and

(iii)   he may be also called upon to act as an agent of change.

The future administrator has to know as much of management, economics and sociology as history, law and politics. The increased complexity of social change and administrative arrangements will make the tasks of the administration more difficult and challenging. He will have to be innovative, adaptable, knowledgeable and perceptive in his assessment of men and situations in order to achieve success in his operations.

To be effective in the eighties public organizations will need to be increasingly more responsive. The key to responsiveness is organizational adaptability to change. The processes of social, economic and political change will continue to accelerate, making

2.   Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleaveland, The Changing Character of the Public Service and the Apministrator of the 1980's in Public Administration'', Readings in Institutions, Processes, Behaviour, edited by Robert T. Golenberwski, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1976, pp. 135-150.

it vitally important that organizations adapt. Organization leaders must learn to anticipate social, economic and political change and to capitalize on it. There will be conditions under which the patterns of change will require organizational growth. But there will be equally as many and perhaps more situations in which these change processes will require organizational decline, cutback and devolution. The good adminisrtrator in the eighties and beyond will be effective at scanning the political, economic and social horizons and leading the processes of adaptation to growth or decline. Change is more likely to be the result of imaginative policies and difficult economic, political and social choices than the application of technological solutions.

The effective public administrator will continue to be the "rational calculator" of different ways of implementing public policies. He will have to learn to satisfy conflicting public demands and understand the continual need of increasing public services with fixed resources. Administrative success will come to be measured by concrete success in implementation. This will require the administrator to be fully involved in the processes of choice making and planning. Good administrators will be planners, and blend the processes of planning and administration. The Fulton Committee for civil service reform set up in UK recommended increasing professionalisation of the civil services to meet the changing needs of the times. Administrators have to keep abreast of the rapid changes in knowledge and technology and knowhow to implement them in the changing socio-economic environment of our times. With the increasing diversification of tasks of the civil services, there is no room for the 'amateur' in administration now. What is needed is a 'specialist' or a 'professional' civil servant who has acquired the requisite professional training and is truly dedicated and 'committed' to the goals and objectives of his service.

Public administration in the current decades will have to face a host of challenges, continuous loads and pressures that will put its adaptability and performance capacity to a severe test. If man is to survive in the face of nuclear threats, overpopulation, environmental pollution, rapid technological change coupled with increasing societal turbulence, public administration will have to learn to decentralize, democratize and humanize itself, says Gerald Caiden. Public administration in any case has to face continuous dilemmas pulling it in opposite directions. Administration in modern society has become an all pervasive affair through political direction, economic management, social engineering and increased bureaucratization. On the other hand, in modern administrative states this has resulted in an opposite backlash in the growing demand for decentralization, democratization, and increased public participation in administration. Frustrated underprivileged groups in every society display considerable loss of confidence in public institutions, and create constant tensions in society by refusing to

assimilate. Both industrial and developing societies face social tensions and upheavals in some form or the other.

In fact the current worldwide rise in social violence and turbulence may be one of the first symptoms of the organizational societies to cope with social change and rising population expectations induced by technological change. In every modern state, it is the adaptive capacity of the administrative culture which plays a key role in maintaining social harmony and order in societies. Unless the administrative system is geared to keep pace with cultural transformation, social discontent, alienation and violence may ultimately lead to the breakdown of the social fabric.[3]

Public administration, as Orion White points out, has to be revamped with the confrontation between technological and social imperatives to cope with the organizational demands of the technological imperative, and to cope with the necessities of the social imperatives.

The conventional image of the public administrator has been adverse. Bureaucracy has been viewed as synonymous with red-tape, rigidity, conservatism, ineptitude in dealing with change and crisis, and conformist patterns of behaviour. Bureaucrats, in general, have a tendency to suppress grievances, cover up mistakes, and ridicule complaints. The new breed of administrators are expected to be more innovative, aware of new administrative techniques and more responsive to public demands. By recognizing emerging problems, minimizing delay and formality, they have to learn to act promptly and with precision. Administration must be capable of quick improvisation and willingness to assume new responsibilities.

To cope with current societal problems the modern bureaucrat will have to acquire multiple roles, such as:[4]

(a) Crusading reformer, intent on transforming some aspect of community life according to preconceived notions of the ideal society.

(b) Proactive policy formulator, ready with possible strategies to meet the unknown.

(c) Social change agent, ready to accept new ideals and to push others into accepting them also.

(d) Crisis manager, slow to burn but quick to act, and brilliant at immediate improvisation.

3. Gerald E. Caiden, *Dynamics of Public Administration*, pp. 290-291, Rinehart, New York, 1971.
4. *ibid.*

A countrywide plan prepared by the Centre to be implemented in different states requires coordination and integration between the Centre and the states. (2) Centralization reduces conflicts and overlapping jurisdictions.

Operational difficulties in the way of decentralization are: (i) the influence of local pressure groups upon decentralized units, (ii) the difficulty of coordinating decentralised functions, (iii) the problem of delimiting geographical jurisdictions, and (iv) decentralization, particularly in the present day world, has important limitations since policy in regard to defence, foreign affairs, communications and planning has to be formulated, integrated, coordinated and executed by a strong national government in all states.

Centralization and decentralization are not axiomatic principles of administration which can be universally applied to all types of administrations; they have a contextual relevance. According to James W. Fesler, there are four factors which are relevant in opting for a centralized or decentralized system. These are responsibility, administration, function, and external factors.[40]

Since authority and responsibility go hand in hand in public administration and as long as the central authority is held ultimately responsible for any action, it is often unwilling and reluctant to delegate discretionary authority to field offices. Among the administrative factors, mentioned by Fesler, are "age of the agency, stability of its policies and methods, competence of its field personnel, pressure for speed and economy, and administrative sophistication. The main functional factors may be the variety of functions an agency performs, the technical nature of functions, and the need for nationwide uniformity. It is common experience that while certain types of functions like defence, planning, communications etc. pull in the direction of centralization, operating decisions can be easily decentralized at the appropriate lowest units. Among the external factors may be included the demand for popular participation in programmes and the pressure of political parties for operationalizing the concept of grassroots democracy and 'planning from below' in many states.

Decentralization for Development

One of the oft-recurring debates in the developing countries centres around the degree of control that central governments can and should have over development planning and administration. The centralization versus decentralization debate has been more insistent in the wake of new shifts in the development

40.   F.M. Marx, *Elements of Public Administration*, pp. 251-258.

strategy of Third World countries. Since the early fifties, the general trend was towards centralized planning and development efforts to achieve socio-economic goals. Central planning was introduced in most developing countries in the 1950s as a means of optimum utilisation of scarce national resources to achieve rapid growth. Under tight central control capital intensive industrialization policies, that were aimed at maximising gains in national income, were advocated by economic development theorists during the 50's and 60's. The benefits of such centralized planning and industrialization, it was felt, would "trickle down" and spread throughout the length and breadth of the developed societies, alleviating poverty and pushing the countries into a stage of self-sustaining economic growth. Central planning and administration were considered necessary to guide and control the economy and to unify and integrate the newly independent countries, emerging from long periods of colonial rule. Moreover, central control was implicit in the requirements of the international assistance agencies which were providing large amounts of capital during the 1950's and 1960's to these countries. These agencies gave aid on the understanding that borrowers would undertake comprehensive and long term plans for the investment of external capital.

However, by the end of the 1960's there was widespread disillusionment with centralized models of growth in developing countries. Sluggish economic growth coupled with widespread income and regional disparities were rampant in these societies. Many development planners and administrators, therefore, started questioning the very rationale behind these concepts of development.

Governments of developing countries started giving much more attention to providing for the basic needs of the poor and underprivileged, to see that economic growth was coupled with relative social equity. During the seventies many governments in Asia, Latin America and Africa began experimenting not only with new approaches to economic and social development, but also with new political and administrative arrangements for implementing development programmes and projects. The increasing interest in decentralization arose from three converging factors discussed earlier.

First, it emerged from disillusionment with the results of highly centralized planning and control of development activities during the 1950's and 1960's. Second, it arose from the implicit requirements in the growth—with equity policies of the 1970's for new ways of managing social development progrommes. Finally, it evolved from the growing realization among policy analysts during the early 1980's that as societies become more complex and government activities expand, it would be increasingly difficult to plan and

administer all development activities effectively and efficiently from the centre.[41]

Advocates of decentralization have offered a long list of reasons for transferring more responsibility for development planning and administration to local governments, voluntary organizations, and regional authorities. Rondinelli has identified the variety of arguments that have been made in favour of decentralization.[42]

1. Decentralization can be a means of overcoming the severe limitations of centrally controlled national planning by delegating greater authority for development planning, and management, to field officials, who are closer to the local people and their problems. It will allow them to tailor development plans and programmes to the needs of heterogeneous regions and groups.

2. Decentralization can cut through the enormous amount of red-tape and rigid rules and regulations characteristic of centralized planning and administration.

3. It will lead to closer citizen-administration contacts leading to greater public participation in administration.

4. Decentralization could also allow better political and administrative penetration of national policies into remote areas, where central government plans are often unknown or ignored or undermined by local elite.

5. Greater representation for various religious, ethnic, political or tribal groups in development decision making could lead to greater equity in the allocation of government resources and investments.

6. It would lead to the development of greater administrative capacity among local governments and private institutions in the regions and provinces.

7. Decentralization can lead to more flexible, innovative, and creative administration. Regional, provincial or district administrative units may have greater opportunities to test innovations and to experiment with new policies and programmes in selected areas without having to justify them for the whole country. If the experiments fail, their impacts are limited to small jurisdictions, if they succeed, they can be repeated in other areas also.

8. By reducing diseconomies of scale inherent in the over-concentration of decision-making in the national capital, decentralization can increase the number of public goods and services—and the efficiency with which they are delivered at lower cost.

41. Dennis A. Rondinelli and G. Shabbir Cheema, *Decentralization and Development*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1983, p. 10.

42. *ibid.*, pp. 14-16.

9. Decentralization allows local leaders to locate services and facilities more effectively within their communities, to integrate isolated or backward areas into regional economies, and to monitor and evaluate the implementation of development projects more effectively than can be done by central planning agencies.

10. It can increase political stability and national unity by giving groups in different sections of the country the ability to participate more directly in development decision making, thereby increasing their "stake in maintaining the political system."

Democratic Decentralization in India

The proposal for democratic decentralization in India was first mooted in the report of Balwant Rai Mehta study team in 1957 recommending a three-tier system of rural local government, called the Panchayati Raj, in India. The principal thrust of the report was towards decentralization of democratic institutions in an effort to shift decision centres closer to the people, to enable their participation, and to put the bureaucracy under local popular control. The uniqueness of Panchayati Raj institutions was to lie in their development orientation in the specific context of planned economic change as also in their treating the elected representatives of the people as the motivating power and instrument behind this development. Democratic decentralization implies people's right to initiate their own projects for local well-being and the power to execute and operate them in an autonomous manner.

The term Panchayati Raj refers to a three-tier structure of rural local self-government in each district. It calls for a transfer of responsibility for much of rural development administration to these local authorities. Each state in India was asked to evolve a system of Panchayati Raj keeping in mind the principles laid down by the Balwant Rai Mehta study team. Most of the states have a three-tier structure of the Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat at the village level, the Panchayat Samiti at the block level and Zila Parishad at the district level.

In 1958, the National Development Council of the Government of India while endorsing the proposals for democratic decentralization stressed the following principles:

1. There should be a three-tier structure of local self-governing bodies from village to district levels, with an organic link from the lower to the higher ones.

2. There should be a genuine transfer of power and responsibility to these bodies.

3. Adequate financial resources should be transferred to these bodies to enable them to discharge the responsibilities.

4. All development programmes at these levels should be channelled through these bodies.

5. The system evolved should be such as to facilitate further decentralization of power and responsibility in future.

The significance of these institutions lay in the fact that the motive force for development was to come from the people themselves, the state assisting with supplies, services and credit. The cooperative principle was to be applied infinitely to solve all problems of rural life.

Panchayati Raj is now operating in most of the states in India. However, the existing local institutions are not in a position to show a satisfactory record due to limitations under which they have been working. The varied administrative problems of democratic decentralization may be summarised as follows:

1. Whether and to what extent should the 'deliberative', and 'executive' functions be combined in the hands of the Panchayati Raj bodies. If only policy making functions are entrusted to the elected bodies, as in a parliamentary government, the important purpose of organising the community for effective action and getting from the people maximum contribution in resources, voluntary labour and enthusiasm, for the tasks of development would not be achieved.

2. While imbibing some of the virtues of bureaucratic administration like impartiality, objectivity and non-political character, the chances are that it will imbibe some of the weaknesses too of the existing administrative culture.

3. The role of the government functionaries will be affected. Some of them will gradually get converted into employees of the local authorities.

4. The problem of 'politicisation', the high degree of illiteracy, caste and communal factions leave little scope for emergence of healthy leadership in the Panchayati Raj bodies.

5. Problems of inter-relationships between the different levels of government, the Village Panchayat, the Panchayat Samiti, the Zila Parishad, district administration and state government will arise from time to time.

6. New technologies discovered have led critics to state that the efficient use of modern technology cannot be ensured through small administrative units, for instance, new varieties of wheat had been discovered making way for what came to be known as the 'green revolution' in India. From then on a distinct technological orientation began to be given to agriculture inducing the central government to make direct inroads into agricultural planning and development bypassing both the state and local governments.

The present practice of the central government is to use its own bureaucracy for the transfer of technology in rural areas, or

administration of special rural oriented programmes, ignoring popular institutions. This has been greatly welcomed by the administrative elite who were in any case not kindly disposed towards Panchayati Raj bodies which they felt, provided an opportunity for grassroots politicians to interfere in the affairs of the bureaucracy.

All these factors, have cumulatively resulted in a low-profile Panchayati Raj since the mid-sixties. The Indian political system had started displaying markedly centralizing tendencies from around the same time the pace of which got further accelerated since 1971 due to various reasons. This exactly was not the climate under which Panchayati Raj could grow and flourish and it is scarcely surprising that most Panchayati Raj bodies are now languishing for lack of funds or sheer neglect.

Issues in Field-Headquarters Relationship

The term 'headquarters', refers to the centrally located chief directing and supervising office of government establishments in contrast to regional or field offices spread out in different areas of the country. In the Indian administrative system, 'headquarters' means the secretariat, and the term 'field' refers to attached and subordinate offices. Though much of the important business of the government is carried out in the headquarters, about seventy-five per cent of the administrative work in all countries is actually carried out in the numerous field offices under the various departments of the national and state governments at the regional, state, divisional, district and lower levels. For, it is in the field that taxes are collected, laws are enforced and welfare services of the government are rendered to the people.

The vastness of the size and area of some modern states, the tremendous expansion of the welfare functions of government, improvement in the field of transportation and communication leading to greater headquarters-field contact, and the general trend towards democratic and decentralized administration have all led to the tremendous importance and expansion of field establishments in every administration of the world.

There are two major issues involved in the headquarters-field relationship : (i) territorial-functional dichotomy, and (ii) communications and control.

Territorial-Functional Dichotomy

The organizational pattern of field offices from the angle of supervision, direction and control can be of two types—territorial or functional. Willoughby has called them unitary or multiple. In the territorial unitary type, the central headquarters establishes regional territorial offices which are entrusted with supervisory

and discretionary administrative functions over the whole area. The officer in charge of the regional office is the head of the administrative hierarchy of the same office and heads of all other specialized units at that level are his subordinates. He is the main medium of communication between the headquarters and the field office and owes responsibility to the central office alone for all acts committed by the officials working under him. In the multiple or functional form, the different divisions or branches of the headquarters office have their corresponding field establishments at different regional levels and maintain direct contact with them. There is no coordinating or integrating officer or agency at the area level, each service or agency is considered autonomous in its own sphere, the line of authority running directly from it to its headquarters counterpart. The main difference between the two systems is that while in the unitary system the head of the station is "the general manager of the station in the fullest acceptance of the term"; in the multiple system, "the station is looked upon as an assembly of units which are only loosely held together for matters of general administration by the authority of the head of the station."[43]

In the unitary system there is unity of command and it establishes supremacy of generalists over specialists in administration. Its main advantages are:

1. It is truly a decentralized system which tends to give maximum powers to the field rather than concentrate authority at the top.

2. It allows much flexibility in management of regional problems and affairs to the area head who can make any modification and procedural change suiting his area needs without affecting the entire agency work.

3. It ensures sufficient independence and autonomy to each division of the field office from its central counterpart allowing initiative and responsibility to develop among field administrators.

4. It is very useful for departments whose functions are varied in nature and scope.

A good example of the territorial unitary type of field organization is the prefectural system in France. As head of the department (the largest unit of local administration) and also as a central government agent, the prefect has a dual role to play in administrative affairs.

The various services in the field of a Department (Province) are under the prefect and the various departments of the central

43. W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration*, p. 139.

government deal with them through that officer. In India, the collector of the district also exercises almost similar functions as that of a prefect in France.

In the functional or multiple system, each functional unit is directly connected with its central counterpart, the station chief being responsible only for the minimum establishment duties of the station. It is a system of "dual command", as under it area functional experts or technical personnel take orders from both the station officer and the functional counterparts at the central office (headquarters). The main advantage of this system is that technical operations in field offices come under the direct control and direction of the central experts.

The pattern of central control over field offices has been described by Luther Gulick who discovers three patterns of field organization, namely : (i) All fingers, (ii) Short arms, long fingers and (iii) Long arms, short fingers. Under the first pattern the headquarters office deals directly with the field stations without the intervention of any regional sub-divisions anywhere. In the second type, there are geographical divisions, but they are located in the headquarters office itself and not in the field, for example, in the External Affairs Ministry in India. It has no less than hundred sections, administrative, territorial and technical. These are grouped into a dozen divisions such as the American Division, Western Division, Southern Division, Protocol Division and External Publicity Division. Under the third pattern, there are geographical divisions and sub-divisions, located in the field away from the headquarters, for example, divisional and district offices in the states in India.

The pattern of headquarters-field relationship are of principally two types. The first relates to a single governmental programme with headquarters office in the capital, and a sub-structure in the field which may include regional, state and local offices at one or more of these levels or all of them in combination. In the second type of arrangement a number of different governments at different levels coordinately occupy themselves with a particular type of programme, as the case of public health for example. In the first arrangement, relationships are vertical and occur within the same federal agency. In the second, they are both vertical and lateral because they occur in a line from the central to related agencies of different governments at different levels (federal, state and local) and also between federal field units and agencies of other governments at the same level.

Field establishments are to be found both in centralized and decentralised administrative units. Under a centralised system the field offices are merely executing agencies; and their internal organisation as well as working are wholly controlled by the central organisation. Under a decentralized system, the field

offices work under a general grant of authority, and in most matters their decisions are final, except in cases for which there is provision for an appeal or review by the central office.

Communication and Control

Establishment of a system of good and effective headquarters-field relationship depends to a great extent on smooth and effective channels of communication between them. Very often the non-fulfilment of tasks and functions entrusted to field agencies is due to lack of understanding and effective communication between the central and the field office. The communication often takes a one way form, that is, from top to bottom in the form of directives, orders and circulars.

Notings on files and office manuals are also other channels of communication. In India there is very little feedback from below (field offices to headquarters), a situation which needs to be remedied. If proper performance of duties by the field officials is to be ensured a more adequate system of communication from top to bottom and vice versa is to be encouraged.

Another issue of field-headquarters relationship which is of importance is the need for an effective system of control over the field establishments. There are three main methods of headquarters control over field establishments.

1. Advance review : Prior referring of matters to headquarters for decision. Thus the central office gets full control over all major decisions regarding budget, matters, and managerial problems by the system of advance reviews.

2. Accounts and reporting : One of the usual methods of exercising control over subordinate offices is for the headquarters to insist on receiving information from the field agencies in the form of returns, reports and statistics relating to the progress of field operations.

3. Audit and inspection : This is a very important method of examining compliance with rules and regulations in financial dealings to check unauthorized or any kind of excess or illegal expenditure.

Periodic inspection by headquarters staff is meant to ensure that the existing office rules, regulations and procedures are observed. Besides ensuring compliance with instructions, it examines the legality of all administrative transactions in field offices.

Measures to Strengthen Field-headquarters Relationship

For the smooth and effective functioning of field establishments and the removal of all major irritants in headquarters-field

relationships, the following prerequisites are required:

1. The powers, authority and responsibility of field officers should be clearly delimited, and contingency powers clearly defined, coupled with considerable autonomy given in local matters to field offices.

2. Communication between headquarters and field offices should be two-way, from top to bottom and vice-versa.

3. There should be an adequate system of training for field personnel to make them more prepared for their tasks in the field.

4. Periodic transfers from field to headquarters and vice versa are imperative to inculcate a balanced outlook on local requirements and national policies.

5. Formal inspections, submissions of periodic reviews and reports should be supplemented by informal visits of headquarters staff to build up rapport and camaraderie between the headquarters and field.

Organisation of Field Offices in India

Where the implementation of the central government policies require devolution of executive powers and the setting up of field establishments for purposes of regulation, execution or control, a ministry has under it subordinate field stations which are known as attached and subordinate offices. The attached offices are responsible for providing executive direction in the implementation of policies and programmes of the ministry to which they are affiliated. They also provide necessary technical information and advice to the ministry on technical problems and issues arising under their jurisdiction. The subordinate offices function as field establishments or as agencies responsible for the detailed execution of government decisions. They normally function under the supervision of an attached office, or directly under a ministry. The pattern of important attached and subordinate offices working under two major central government ministries are illustrated below.

Ministry of Finance

The important attached offices of this ministry are : (i) Office of the National Savings Commissioner, (ii) Indian Security Press, (iii) Government of India Mints, (iv) Silver Refinery Project Calcutta, and (v) Directorate of Inspection. The subordinate offices of the ministry include : (i) Office of the Regional Director of Companies, (ii) Offices of the Registrar of Companies at a number of places, (iii) Collectors of Customs at ports, (iv) Collectors of Central Excise, and (v) Income Tax Department.

Ministries of Transport and Communication

Besides the main subordinate offices, that is, Meteorological Department and Railway Inspectorate, the Department of Posts and Telegraphs has a network of post and telegraph offices spread through the length and breadth of the country. These may be classified into : (a) regional offices, (b) head offices in big cities, (c) branch offices, and (d) sub-branch offices.

At the state level there are field offices above the district offices at the divisional or regional level under the various departments such as police, education, health, and cooperative societies. The most important field office at the district level is that of the District Collector. The district officer system symbolizes the concentration of central government powers in the regional representative, making him the chief agent of coordination and direction in the field and the main channel of communication between technical field officials and headquarters staff.

8

ADMINISTRATION AND PEOPLE

Criteria of Successful Administration

The importance of public administration has been steadily increasing with the gradual expansion of state activity in modern times. Public administration is now an all encompassing factor of the daily life of the individual as well as the community, which has seen the emergence of what has now been labelled the "Administrative State". The functions of public administration have shown a universal trend of expansion everywhere, whether in the capitalist United States, the communist Soviet Union or the developing countries of the Third World. The early liberal notion of a *leissez faire* state which was to be responsible only for the maintenance of law and order (i.e. philosophy of minimum state intervention in the daily life of the individual and community) has become totally outmoded and irrelevant today. The modern state has undertaken the new role of accelerator of economic and social change as well as the major responsibility for providing modern amenities of life, education, health, improved means of transport and wider opportunities for employment to its citizens.

The major factors which have led to the great expansion of state functions are, firstly, the rise of industrialization and the resulting growth of urbanization; secondly, change in the political philosophy of the state (from individualism to social welfarism); thirdly, the two world wars and the resulting international situation which has also tended to largely increase the functions of the state. The fourth important factor is the vast increase in the population of most of the countries which has immensely complicated the problem of providing food, shelter and other necessities of life to their citizens. This has led to the adoption of planning on the part of many states to solve the ever growing problems of administration. These factors taken together led to the emergence of what is called the Great Society, which in turn contributed to the establishment of 'Big Government' in almost

every advancing country. Big Government, in the words of F.M. Marx requires a large apparatus to carry on its many functions. Public administration, therefore, seeks to achieve new and positive objectives. The fundamental principles of the welfare state have greatly transformed the work of public administration, with the result that the older regulatory functions have become much less prominent and the newly created departments for rendering various social services as well as for pursuing development and research have assumed greater importance.

Gladden lays down three general characteristics of an efficient system of public administration:

(1) It must be capable of meeting the functional aims for which it has been brought into being.

(2) It must be able to meet the long term changes postulated both by the alterations in the social environment and by the general development of administrative technique.

(3) It must, while conforming to a centralized plan, be capable of meeting the various special demands of the separate departmental units.[1]

Apart from efficiency and integrity the administrator needs to have a human approach to all problems and programmes that he has to solve and implement. This implies that he must have the spirit of service to the community which is absolutely essential in democracies. Also (1) he should possess a broad outlook on public affairs; (2) his only aim should be to help the public rather than get bogged down with a rigid and mechanical implementation of rules and regulations; (3) he should have the capacity to judge upon relevant advice and take decisions promptly; and (4) when a decision has been taken, the administrator should inspire and motivate his staff at all ranks to execute it effectively. Every successful administration should be result-oriented, speedy and prompt in meeting the demands of the public. What is needed is not a 'procedure-oriented' bureaucracy, but a more 'performance oriented' one.

Today public administration relates to the whole of society and the political economy. Thus assuming its overwhelming importance, the question may now be asked : What is the criteria of successful administration ? What is the ideal administrator supposed to do to achieve success in his job ? The answer depends on the norms we lay down for judging the success or measuring the worth of any administrative system. The norms of an administrative system are both old and new. Traditional norms—efficiency, economy, good management and public interest are well

1. E.N. Gladden, *The Civil Service*, Staples, London, 1956, pp. 123-124.

established measures of judging the success of any administrative system. To these old ones can be added : socio-economic progress, equality and justice. Inequality among men and nations has been one of the most critical social, economic and political character- istic of our time. Widespread inequalities provide the breeding ground for social fermentation, dissent and alienation. A public administration which accelerates these problems or does nothing to ameliorate them will be unpopular and shortsighted in approach. A vigorous goal oriented and dynamic administration catering to required social change corresponds to the present climate. Fundamental to this concept of administration is the premise that administration must be value-oriented and not value neutral, since value neutrality is neither probable nor desirable in existing class divided societies.

In most democratic countries the government represents the people's choice and administration becomes an instrument for the welfare and service to the people. The twin pillars of democracy are liberty and equality hence the measure of successful administration is to be judged by the extent to which the admini- stration has served these goals.

The public administrators in all countries should accept their role as servants of the public devoted to the realization of public interests and general well being. Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleveland state that:[2]

(i) The future administrator will be more of a moral leader, mediator and coordinator than mere issuer of orders;

(ii) he will learn to be a tactician and politician as he will be subject to vastly increased political pressures; and

(iii) he may be also called upon to act as an agent of change.

The future administrator has to know as much of manage- ment, economics and sociology as history, law and politics. The increased complexity of social change and administrative arrange- ments will make the tasks of the administration more difficult and challenging. He will have to be innovative, adaptable, knowledge- able and perceptive in his assessment of men and situations in order to achieve success in his operations.

To be effective in the eighties public organizations will need to be increasingly more responsive. The key to responsiveness is organizational adaptability to change. The processes of social, economic and political change will continue to accelerate, making

2. Richard L. Chapman and Frederic N. Cleaveland, The Changing Character of the Public Service and the Apministrator of the 1980's in Public Adminis- tration", Readings in Institutions, Processes, Behaviour, edited by Robert T. Golenberwski, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1976, pp. 135-150.

it vitally important that organizations adapt. Organization leaders must learn to anticipate social, economic and political change and to capitalize on it. There will be conditions under which the patterns of change will require organizational growth. But there will be equally as many and perhaps more situations in which these change processes will require organizational decline, cutback and devolution. The good adminisrtrator in the eighties and beyond will be effective at scanning the political, economic and social horizons and leading the processes of adaptation to growth or decline. Change is more likely to be the result of imaginative policies and difficult economic, political and social choices than the application of technological solutions.

The effective public administrator will continue to be the "rational calculator" of different ways of implementing public policies. He will have to learn to satisfy conflicting public demands and understand the continual need of increasing public services with fixed resources. Administrative success will come to be measured by concrete success in implementation. This will require the administrator to be fully involved in the processes of choice making and planning. Good administrators will be planners, and blend the processes of planning and administration. The Fulton Committee for civil service reform set up in UK recommended increasing professionalisation of the civil services to meet the changing needs of the times. Administrators have to keep abreast of the rapid changes in knowledge and technology and knowhow to implement them in the changing socio-economic environment of our times. With the increasing diversification of tasks of the civil services, there is no room for the 'amateur' in administration now. What is needed is a 'specialist' or a 'professional' civil servant who has acquired the requisite professional training and is truly dedicated and 'committed' to the goals and objectives of his service.

Public administration in the current decades will have to face a host of challenges, continuous loads and pressures that will put its adaptability and performance capacity to a severe test. If man is to survive in the face of nuclear threats, overpopulation, environmental pollution, rapid technological change coupled with increasing societal turbulence, public administration will have to learn to decentralize, democratize and humanize itself, says Gerald Caiden. Public administration in any case has to face continuous dilemmas pulling it in opposite directions. Administration in modern society has become an all pervasive affair through political direction, economic management, social engineering and increased bureaucratization. On the other hand, in modern administrative states this has resulted in an opposite backlash in the growing demand for decentralization, democratization, and increased public participation in administration. Frustrated underprivileged groups in every society display considerable loss of confidence in public institutions, and create constant tensions in society by refusing to

assimilate. Both industrial and developing societies face social tensions and upheavals in some form or the other.

In fact the current worldwide rise in social violence and turbulence may be one of the first symptoms of the organizational societies to cope with social change and rising population expectations induced by technological change. In every modern state, it is the adaptive capacity of the administrative culture which plays a key role in maintaining social harmony and order in societies. Unless the administrative system is geared to keep pace with cultural transformation, social discontent, alienation and violence may ultimately lead to the breakdown of the social fabric.[3]

Public administration, as Orion White points out, has to be revamped with the confrontation between technological and social imperatives to cope with the organizational demands of the technological imperative, and to cope with the necessities of the social imperatives.

The conventional image of the public administrator has been adverse. Bureaucracy has been viewed as synonymous with red-tape, rigidity, conservatism, ineptitude in dealing with change and crisis, and conformist patterns of behaviour. Bureaucrats, in general, have a tendency to suppress grievances, cover up mistakes, and ridicule complaints. The new breed of administrators are expected to be more innovative, aware of new administrative techniques and more responsive to public demands. By recognizing emerging problems, minimizing delay and formality, they have to learn to act promptly and with precision. Administration must be capable of quick improvisation and willingness to assume new responsibilities.

To cope with current societal problems the modern bureaucrat will have to acquire multiple roles, such as:[4]

(a) Crusading reformer, intent on transforming some aspect of community life according to preconceived notions of the ideal society.

(b) Proactive policy formulator, ready with possible strategies to meet the unknown.

(c) Social change agent, ready to accept new ideals and to push others into accepting them also.

(d) Crisis manager, slow to burn but quick to act, and brilliant at immediate improvisation.

3. Gerald E. Caiden, *Dynamics of Public Administration*, pp. 290-291, Rinehart, New York, 1971.

4. *ibid.*

(e) Dynamic programme manager, able to shape new courses and adapt on-going arrangements.

(f) Humanitarian employer, treating staff with respect and meting out even-handed justice.

(g) Political campaigner, responsive to public needs and champion of public causes.

(h) Competent administrator, ensuring effective performance with minimum political embarrassment.

(i) Interest broker choosing among competing interests and reconciling all parties to the outcome.

(j) Public relations expert, adept at building up support and showing his area to advantage.

(k) Speedy decision maker, prepared to assume responsibility and clear instructions.

(l) Constructive thinker, not easily lead astray by others who would want to make up his mind for him.

(m) Optimistic leader, not easily discouraged in adversity, but able to command attention and stimulate subordinates.

Obviously, to expect every bureaucrat to be so versatile is to be unrealistic perhaps, and expect the unattainable. However, the attempt should be to approximate as closely as possible the ideal in practice. The ideal best serves as a pointer to which education, training and recruitment systems for bureaucrats should aim. In practice every administrator will perform as best as he can given the socio-economic, cultural, environmental and operational constraints at any given period of time.

Variables for successful administration are identified below:

(a) Recognize new solutions rather than modify old ones.

(b) Reformulate problems in new terms to elicit new responses and initiatives.

(c) Turn crisis to advantage; use deviation and conflict in problem solving to generate self-transformation with minimum alienation.

(d) Deal with uncertainty and fluidity and absorb change, instability and interdependence.

(e) Tolerate deviation, conflict, and confrontation without over-reading or loosing sense of proportion.

(f) Mobilize resources to meet problems and engage in inter-disciplinary problem-solving.

5. Ibid., p. 297.

(g) Encourage error-correction, initiative and creativity, and learn from mistakes.

(h) Learn from experience and uncertainty.

(i) Remain human and humane under stress.

It is within this framework of universal norms that the administrator of today should try to operate in future in the environment of any administrative system at any given period of time.

The importance of public administration in the modern age is universally recognized, but there is no general agreement on the ends it is supposed to serve in all societies. In the context of the developing countries of the Third World, a new perspective of administration known as 'development administration' has been evolved catering to the changing needs and socio-cultural context of administration in these states. The twin goals of development administration are nation-building and progress. It involves the establishment of an administrative machinery to plan the mobilization of all available resources to raise the standard of living of the people. The rapid transformation of developing societies towards progress and development in all spheres of life needs extensive governmental intervention. Public administration must become more change oriented, dynamic and involved. In short, there is need for debureaucratisation of attitudes of the public personnel in these countries. With the great advancement of science and invention of new managerial techniques the problem of administration has become so complex that despite the adoption of right policies, wrong administrative steps may lead to societal breakdown or considerable chaos and disruption. Therefore, in the words of Fayol, the pursuit of greater knowledge of public administration becomes the essential element in modern times. While Paul Pigors contends that the main purpose of administration is to preserve the status quo in society, Brooks Adams regards administration as a chief agent of social change. There is no limit to the service which the state is called upon to perform. The increase in the variety, number and complexity of functions that have to be performed by the modern state, often results in an 'administrative lag' in many countries specially those of the Third World. A serious imbalance often develops between aspirations and performance which may constitute a major obstacle to national development. The task of every successful administration should be to continually try to bridge the gap between aspirations and performance and develop the administrative capacity to implement its programmes of economic and social progress. Therefore, in conclusion, to quote Charles Beard,

The future of civilized government and even, I think, of civilization itself, rests upon our ability to develop a service and

philosophy and a practice of administration competent to discharge the public functions of civilized society.

Attaining Democratic and Socialistic Goals

The two ends of public administration in most welfare states of modern times, are the widespread democratisation of administration and the achievement of progressive social equity. Every philosophy of administration has to take into consideration the political, social and cultural milieu in which it functions. For the citizens of a great part of the western world headed by the USA and England the political environment is democratic. In India both democracy and socialism have been adopted as the twin objectives of the Constitution and state policy.

There is a general school of thinking that administration being a universal prerequisite of all states, its methods and techniques of functioning are also the same everywhere. Experience has, however, contradicted this tenor of argument. The spirit and temper of public administration is deeply infl'enced by the type of government which operates it. In autocratic governments administration tends to become despotic. Similarly, the first requirement of a democratic government is a democratic administration. A democratic government by itself is no guarantee to democratic administration. It often happens that the political system is democratic, but administration due to its past political and administrative culture may not be truly democratic in the spirit of its functioning. India is a classic example of the above statement. After independence a democratic system of government was adopted but there is the repeated complaint that the administration still retains its historical and colonial authoritarian legacies in character and style of functioning. Experience has also shown that even where administrative posts are elective (e.g. in the USSR) administration is no less bureaucratic. Whether an administration is more democratic or bureaucratic in nature can be measured from its behaviour pattern towards the citizens and with its own members. In his famous book. *Democratic Administration*, Ordway Tead discusses the essential features of a democratic public administration in the following manner.

In the first place in a democratic administration people must be guaranteed the maximum opportunities for participation in the making and implementation of public policies. One way of guaranteeing this is through a vigorous system of decentralization of authority by local self-government institutions such as village panchayats, and municipalities. Other ways of soliciting people's participation are by attaching advisory committees and boards, comprising representatives of enlightened citizens and interested groups of persons, with the administrative departments at managerial levels, and second, by seeking the affected citizens' participation in the actual implementation of the administration's

programmes, as is done in the community development administration in India. The Government of India has been making very liberal use of the advisory and consultative bodies at all (central, state and district) levels of administration. The association of such bodies enables the administrators to appreciate the people's viewpoint and is also a good means of seeking the willing cooperation of all affected parties in policy implementation.

Political direction and accountability is one of the chief features of a democratic administration. According to this concept, the civil servants should work according to the will of the political executive, that is, the ministers who are representatives of the people, who are in turn responsible to the Parliament for their actions. Further, in most democratic governments, the actions of administration are subject to judicial review. In a written constitution like India's the civil servants are bound to act within the framework of laws and the constitution. In the constitution, there are built in judicial safeguards against the use of arbitrary authority of administration. The need for judicial control has become all the more imperative because of the tremendous growth of administrative law and adjudication which have greatly expanded the powers of the bureaucracy.

Democratic administration should be open in more senses than one. The policies of the government must be open to public criticism. The government should have enough respect for public opinion and public liberties, such as the freedom of press, and the right of association and demonstration. The administration should be responsive to popular criticism and opinion and should make every effort to express the public will. An efficient system of public relations must be developed at all levels of administration for the quick and effective redressal of citizens' grievances. It must also be open in the sense of maintaining and representing as wide a section of the population as possible and must not operate in the interest of the ruler or of any particular group or class. If administration is to function democratically social barriers of caste, class, regionalism, provincialism or linguism must not be allowed to create obstacles in the path of its free and fair functioning. It must be recruited from a wide social strata. Democratic administration is in reality a cooperative enterprise in which the governmental agencies, professional and other citizen groups cooperatively endeavour for the attainment of public welfare. In developed democratic countries, people's participation in administration is very well organized; voluntary associations play an important role and public administration is truly a cooperative enterprise. However, in developing countries of the Third World, where civic consciousness is quite undeveloped and voluntary associations are still in a formative stage, the main burden of administrative work falls on the bureaucracy, which in most

countries still tends to be authoritarian and paternalistic in its attitude and manner of working.

Democratic administration also means a particular style of functioning in the internal matters of the organization. In democratic administration the stress is not only on the importance of relations between the civil servants and citizens but also on the relations of the civil servants *inter se*. Public administration like the functioning of any large organization may acquire a callous impersonality in relation to its own members where individual employee becomes a mere cog in a huge machine. It is the duty of every employee in public organizations, whether he is in a high or a low position, to treat a fellow employee as an equal partner in a joint enterprise. The managerial heads in government organizations should have the dynamic force of leadership to motivate the employees more by their power of persuasion than in any imposed manner. All matters of dispute between the management and the employees should be sorted out by mutual consultation and negotiations which do not in any way hurt the self-esteem, and sentiments of the employees. In the UK and other democratic countries of the West there are regular joint representative committees and negotiating machinery in each department and agency of the government. In India they are called Staff Councils.

Finally, since it has now been universally recognised that the twin pillars of democracy are liberty and equality, the purpose of democratic administration should be to serve both these ends. In order to achieve these twin objectives in countries like India, it became imperative to adopt the goal of a social welfare state dedicated to achieving social equity through planning and democratic socialism. The basic objective of socialism is to achieve rapid improvement in the living standards of the people through as much equitable distribution of goods and services as possible. Socialism is a necessary concomitant of political democracy. Liberty also means freedom from want and equality of opportunity in every sphere for its true realisation. In India, economic planning became a necessity to achieve socialistic goals. The impact of the socialistic policies of the government can be felt in three ways : (i) the assumption by the state of developmental and social welfare functions, (ii) the expansion in the scope and range of administrative operations both old and new, and (iii) the felt need for the greater association of the people with, and their participation in the administrative process, to facilitate speedy and effective implementation of the plans.

Critics often point out the difficulties in trying to achieve socialism through democratic methods. They tend to maintain that the very concept of planning is authentic to democracy; since in a planned society, many liberties may have to be curbed and freedoms of citizens restricted in the greater interest of public

welfare. It is true that some rights of a few may have to be curbed
to enable the underprivileged many to enjoy the fruits of liberty
and to ensure a more equalitarian distribution of goods and
services. Socialism and planning involve a certain measure of
centralization and increase in the sphere of state powers. However,
every effort should be made to make the administration more
socialistically controlled and accountable to the public through
greater degree of decentralization at all levels.

Another widely held notion is that too much emphasis on
people's participation in politics and socialization of means of
production leads to inefficiency and bureaucratization. No doubt,
there is an element of truth in this assertion but this may only
happen in the early stages of democratization and socialization of
administration. Democracy and socialism will have to grow roots
in a country to be able to work harmoniously together in the long
run.

Democracy and socialism are the worthy goals towards which
all administrations, specially those of the developing nations which
are still evolving an administrative culture, must strive. The
concept of development administration which is dynamic and goal-
oriented needs to be a part of the administrative ethic of all new
and developing nations—the twin values of development being
nation-building and socio-economic progress. Democracy needs
decentralization and popular participation, whereas socialism
requires centralization, planning and control. A harmonious blend
of both can only be the task of every successful administration.

People's Participation in India

The need and desirability of mass participation in the political
processes of society has been widely proclaimed, time and again,
by different writers and philosophers, as divergent in their views as
Aristotle and Marx. The entire theory and practice of democratic
politics rests on the workability of the notion of an active citizen
involvement in the holding and sharing of power and responsibili-
ties of government and public office. The concept of public
participation was first operational in ancient Greece where
democracy as a form of government originated. In the direct
democracies of ancient Greece all important decisions were taken
by popular assemblies and the citizens were active participants in
the affairs of state. Since then the meaning and content of demo-
cracy has both widened and narrowed with the changing nature
and role of state. The connotation of democracy has now widened
to include with the political a social and economic content as
well.

Liberty and equality are now the twin goals of a democratic
state. Increase in the size and population of modern states has made

the operation of direct democracies impossible. Modern democracies now operate on the principle of indirect public participation through representative institutions.

In the modern era of the 'administrative state' many writers have voiced their concern over the problem of responsiveness of the administrative state to the norms of democratic procedures. To safeguard individual rights and liberties against bureaucratic or arbitrary abuse an increase in people's vigilance and participation in politics is necessary. Modern states should show "concern for individual people in the criteria used in making decisions ; as an effort to assign each person's need equal weight in policy deliberations and as an effort to make as broad as feasible the opportunities for people to participate in the decisions that affect them."[6]

Political scientists are unanimously agreed on the fact that the main utility of extensive public participation in politics is to ensure that the vested interests of the privileged do not prevail over the interests of the majority. To safeguard against such possibilities adequate measures of public accountability and ventilation of public grievances should exist besides avenues of citizen participation in politics.

Rapid socio-economic development is one of the key goals of most governments, specially developing countries where the administration is involved in the economy in various ways. The government tries to achieve its socio-economic objectives through the instrument of public bureaucracy which becomes one of the chief agents of societal change and transformation in these societies. The main problem of administration in developing societies is to reconcile an authoritarian colonial administrative legacy based on a notion of passive political participation to the needs and demands of a goal oriented administration which needs active public cooperation and support to fulfil main targets of developmental plans and programmes of the government. Without such a support even a well conceived plan of development is likely to fail. Development administration is administration for the socio-economic development of the people, by the people and for the people. Their active cooperation and participation in the planning and implementation processes is vital for its success.

Citizen participation may be used both for support by an agency and as a control device by the law makers. Participation has both a broad and a narrow connotation. In a broad sense, it implies giving every citizen an opportunity to actively participate in constructive public work (without belonging to any governing or managing bodies), besides the franchise, in a democracy. In a narrow sense, participation would refer to a specific action by

6. Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration, Policy Making in Government Agencies*, p. 217.

which the citizen registers his involvement in public affairs to achieve a particular objective.

Participation may be direct or indirect, formal or informal; it may be political, social or administrative in nature. The effectiveness of mobilized or institutionalised citizen participation in public administration depends on three factors:

(a) with what degree of seriousness the participant body or agency asserts itself;

(b) whether public administration consults the body; and

(c) whether public administration delegates certain functions to that body.

Citizens' participation in administration may take many forms. It refers to all those activities which show the citizen's involvement in the processes of administration, that is, participation in policy formulation and programme planning, implementation and evaluation of policies and programmes meant for development of particular target groups. In developing societies the traditional definition of people's participation (active citizen involvement in the decision making process) often becomes irrelevant due to lack of time, initiative, and resources of the citizen who fails to show the necessary enthusiasm or cooperation towards governmental programmes meant for his benefit. Therefore, in these countries participatory activities by the citizens have to be solicited by the government. The state not only plays the key role in attempts at socio-economic transformation and modernization but also in promoting, what is called institutional participation.

Citizen participation demands certain preconditions, of these, perhaps, the most important are enlightened political leaders, conscientious civil servants and an informed and cooperative general public. Knowledge of mutual problems and difficulties on the part of both officials and citizens is a vital input for successful participation. Participation at all levels—both rural and urban is also necessary for speedy development.

Problems of People's Participation

The degree and extent of people's participation in the administration of developing countries like India is greatly conditioned by the basic nature and operational peculiarities of administration during the colonial period, when maintenance of law and order, and revenue-raising were the prime considerations of administration. The administrative apparatus and functions were then, to a great extent, autonomous and unaccountable to the public. Public participation neither existed nor was solicited by the government. In the authoritarian and inegalitarian political and administrative

culture in which colonial administration functioned, the benefits of administration accrued mostly to the upper and the privileged classes of society. In terms of methods of operation administration was essentially coercive, formal and procedural.

After independence with the adoption of the goals of a social welfare state, the key responsibility for rapid socio-economic progress and modernization was undertaken by the state which sought to implement them with the help of public bureaucracy. With the beginning of the process of planned development in India the planners and administrators have repeatedly stressed the need to involve the masses and solicit their cooperation in the tremendous challenge of development administration. To shake free the inertia of the masses who had hitherto been only used to being passive recipients of government aid the government sought to create an institutional infrastructure to promote popular participation. Panchayati Raj and community development programmes were introduced mainly to solicit popular participation in the development administration of the government. The community development programme was a method of soliciting community participation to assist the government authorities in improving the economic, social and cultural life of the people in the rural areas.

> They include encouraging the village people to become self-reliant, responsible citizens, capable of participating in socio-economic development and nation building by proper utilization of the scarce resources, adoption of modern agricultural methods and practices. Utilizing the free time of the villagers in useful community work; extending the principle of cooperation to make the rural families credit-worthy ; launching a multipronged attack on hunger, disease, squalor, ignorance and idleness and upgrading the social status of the village teachers and associating them in development programme.[7]

In short, the essence of the concept of rural development is the all round development of the village community with the efforts of the people themselves. Panchayati Raj system was introduced to operationalize the concept of democratic decentralization and devolution of real power and responsibility to the local masses for the development of their areas. The need for citizen participation in the plan formulation and implementation processes have also been repeatedly stated in the objectives of India's Five Year Plans, the recurring theme of which is to bring about the social, economic and political development of the Indian masses with the active inspiration, participation and involvement of the masses themselves in the development programmes.

7. Tarlok Singh, *India's Development Experience*, Macmillan, Delhi, 1974.

Means of Citizen Participation

Low literacy levels, lack of awareness, inertia, poverty and general apathy of the people obviously restrict mass participation in the policy formulation process in India. The citizen can, at best, participate in the outlining of directions and policy objectives only indirectly by (a) electing his representatives to panchayat bodies at the village, block and district levels, to state legislatures, and Parliament; (b) participation by enlightened citizens in seminars, studies and discussions promoted by political parties, pressure groups, youth forums, universities, voluntary associations, press, planning bodies, and government machinery; and (c) by articulation of the needs and demands of people before policy makers and planners through political parties and other institutions.

Citizen viewpoints are also articulated by various agencies such as political parties, pressure groups, press and voluntary associations. Institutional participation refers to the participation of citizens in policy making in government of administrative agencies such as central and state legislatures, Panchayati Raj bodies etc.[8]

Extensive empirical studies on the nature and degree of citizens' participation in India have revealed that the colonial legacy, social diversity, poverty and illiteracy and the peculiarity of the political process combine to greatly restrict popular participation in the public administration in India. The colonial legacy of limited government by an administrative elite stands in the way of the administrators' soliciting extensive public cooperation. Decision-making on all major issues of public policy is monopolised by a small politico-administrative elite in India. The social structure is characterised by numerous cleavages along religious, ethnic, linguistic and class lines. Widespread poverty and illiteracy facilitate the dominance of powerful socio-economic groups in society who monopolise the fruits of development and progress. With the general passivity and subservience of the masses, it is scarcely surprising that the bureaucracy has become a privileged minority who refuse to share any decision-making power with the people. Community development programmes failed to generate the necessary enthusiasm and rural initiative, and donations in cash and kind were not as forthcoming as was required to make the movement a success. It turned out to be more of a 'government's programme' instead of 'people's programme'. The system of democratic decentralization introduced in India did not really devolve power on the masses. The composition of Panchayati Raj bodies merely reflected existing caste and class divisions in rural society besides being subject to political pressures which rendered

8.   For a detailed discussion on the various methods of citizen participation see Noorjahan Bava, *People's Participation in the Development Administration in India*, Uppal, New Delhi, 1984, pp. 55-60.

them ineffective to a great extent. Planning did not eradicate widespread poverty, inequality and unemployment. The fruits of development did not reach the target groups (the rural and urban poor, landless farmers, small artisans, tribals and backward castes) who neither participated in the development programmes nor benefited from them.

The major components of citizen perceptions of administration which are generally considered essential for widespread public participation in development administration are :

1. adequate citizen knowledge of administrative norms and practices;

2. genuine public support for the goals, policies and programmes of the government;

3. positive evaluation of the job performance of governmental officials by the public,

4. perceptions of the administrative system as sensitive and responsive to the public;

5. belief in the integrity and honesty of the administrative cadre, rather than a tendency to view it as corrupt or corruptible;

6. perception of administrators as committed to egalitarian goals and practices;

7. feelings of efficacy and optimism about citizen action in the political system generally and in the administrative sub-system particularly; and

8. motivational orientations emphasizing cooperative action with administrative officials in the implementation of developmental goals.

All these components are essential for the evolution of a balanced citizen-administration relationship, that is, to prevent the dominance or subservience of administration as well as to minimize the ignorance, apathy or helplessness of citizens. Unfortunately, in the present Indian context the major components of this relationship are conspicuous by their absence, which in fact is proving to be the main hurdle in widespread and effective public participation in the public administration in India.

Based on extensive field survey Eldersveld, Jagannadham and Barnabas came out with the following research findings on citizen-administration relations:

The attitudes of Indian citizens towards their government and its administrative officials particularly, is a complex and paradoxical mosaic of support and hostility, of consensus and critique. From 75 per cent to 90 per cent view governmental

jobs as prestigious, 90 per cent feel that health and community development programmes are worthwhile, and less than 50 per cent (20 per cent rural) are critical of the job performance of Central Government officials. On the other hand, the majority feel that 50 per cent or more of the officials are corrupt, large proportions (60 per cent urban, 32 per cent rural) say their dealings with officials are unsatisfactory, and the majority sense that their probabilities of gaining access to officials and being successful in processing their complaints with them are low. Over 50 per cent feel officials in certain agencies are not fair, that the citizen can do little by himself, and from 60 per cent to 75 per cent feel that political pull is important in getting administration action.[9]

Other studies on citizen-administration relations have revealed various reasons for general mistrust and lack of faith of the public in administration. The reasons for this are : (a) corruption, and unhelpful attitude of the bureaucrats, (b) inordinate delay in getting the wheels of the administrative machinery in motion, (c) citizens' ignorance about procedures and formal rules, and (d) discrimination between the rich and the poor; the rich having easy access to administration, and the general tendency of officials to avoid the poor and underplay their needs and interests.

The Indian administrative system has no doubt established a wide network in both rural and urban areas but apparently it still has a very limited impact on the life of citizens whose enthusiasm and cooperation towards it has not been forthcoming. Citizens would have been more involved in the planning, modernization and development processes, if they had felt their demands and expectations are in the process of realization. But in the existing milieu of slow pace of development and failure of rising expectations, it is small wonder that the people are turning increasingly hostile, critical and cynical and a tide of 'revolution of rising functions' has taken over. Although the chief defects of administration which affect the citizen directly are delays in implementation and diffusion of responsibilities rather than faulty planning or incorrect policy-making, in the ultimate analysis the quantity and quality of people's involvement in the socio-economic development in India is set by the elites in all walks of life, particularly the political and administrative.

Citizens become what their leaders make them to be, and adminstration operates under two forces : leader's direction from above and citizen's understanding and cooperation from below. Administration is a trustee subject to the watchful eye

9. Samuel J. Eldersveld, V. Jagannadham, A.P. Barnabas, *The Citizen and the Administrator in a Developing Democracy*, New Delhi, 1968, Indian Institute of Public Administration.

and the guiding hand of people inside and people below. The emphasis on the public and the administration's relations with it are as important for analysis of bureaucracy as the new techniques for improvement of organizational efficiency.[10]

In conclusion,

People's participation in the development process means active cooperation and involvement of the general masses and the targeted public in the various interfaces of the decision-making process in development administration. This calls for their active interests, enthusiasm and co-operation in planning, implementation and evaluation of development programmes at all levels, particularly at the grassroot level. Public participation must become a mass movement, for, it is not only a means to development but in itself a development goal. Public participation is integral to the very process of development particularly the development of a developing democracy like India. It calls for both political and administrative decentralization. The Panchayati Raj institutions were established as institutions of grassroot democracy and of democratic development. In the recent past, the system has lost its old moorings, its ethos and elan. The need of the hour is to revive and rejuvenate the Panchayati Raj bodies by holding elections to them at stated intervals, by devolving adequate resources and power to these local government institutions, by according adequate representation in such bodies to members of weaker sections such as women, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes by compulsory reservation of seats, nomination or cooption as in Gujarat, by eradicating poverty through structural changes in society including more effective implementation of land reforms, increasing production and productivity through modernization, science and technology, generation of employment opportunities and providing a purposeful relevant education to our children and adults and inculcating national unity.[11]

Public Accountability

One of the norms of democratic administration is that power should be commensurate with responsibility and the holders of public office should be accountable to the people for the exercise of authority. This is considered an effective safeguard against the misuse of power and abuse of public authority. Various forms and measures of public accountability of administration have been devised in all democratic states, including India.

10. V. Jagannadham, "Administration and the Citizen", *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 17 (1971), p. 616.

11. Noorjahan Bava, *People's Participation in Development Administration in India*, pp. 194-195.

According to L.D. White,[12] public accountability consists of the "sum total of the constitutional, statutory, administrative and judicial rules and precedents and the established practices by means of which public officials may be held accountable for their official action." In other words, public accountability refers to the liability of government servants to give a satisfactory account of the use of official power or discretionary authority to the people. This is considered a check against arbitrary use of authority. Various formal and objective methods and procedures, (legislative, executive and judicial) have been gradually evolving to ensure the public servant's accountability and responsiveness to the public will in democracies.

With the ever increasing functions and importance of public administration in modern welfare states the issue of public accountability has assumed great importance. The civil servants not only implement policy but in a large measure are actively responsible for their initiation and formulation. In Third World countries where the bureaucracy becomes the chief agent of social and economic change and progress, they have to be given a wide range of discretionary authority to perform their functions. No clear norms and precedents exist and in many situations bureaucrats are largely left to themselves to take decisions. In the authoritarian administrative culture which pervades many of the Third World countries an effective system of public control over administration is a growing imperative to curb all kinds of authoritarian tendencies.

A successful system of administrative control should strike a balance between the effective use of public authority and the democratic rights of the people.

The extent and range of public accountability varies according to the constitutional framework of the country. In direct democracies like Switzerland, the control of the people over administration is far more direct and effective than in indirect democracies. In communist countries like the Soviet Union and China, public accountability, in effect, means accountability of the administration to the communist party. In indirect democracies, the major agencies which exert control over administration are the legislature, executive and the judiciary. In the cabinet form of government, as in England and India, legislative control is more effective than in the presidential form.

In modern democracies people exercise control over the administration through their elected representatives in the legislature. It is the legislature which lays down the policy and sets the administrative wheels in motion. It chalks out the nature and

12. L.D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, p. 495.

scope of administrative action, determines the number of administrative personnel, besides sanctioning requisite funds for the implementation of government policies. The control of the legislature does not end here. It also continues to supervise, direct and control the implementation of administration.

In parliamentary forms of government, it is the political executive, the minister, who is accountable to the legislature for the administrative acts of the departmental heads. The public officials are not personally answerable to parliament for their official acts though they may have to appear before parliamentary committees to defend certain legislative proposals.

In India, the principal methods of legislative control are of three types, that is, control over (i) policy, (ii) departmental acts, and (iii) finances.

The various methods of exercising such control are:

Debates and Discussions

The parliament may exercise control through various debates and discussions which provide an opportunity for the review of governmental policies and their implementation. The more notable occasions for discussion among these are during the president's inaugural speech to both houses of parliament, the budget speech of the finance minister or during the introduction of new legislative proposals.

There are also some other occasions, when various aspects of administration are put up for legislative comment or criticism.

Resolutions or Motions

The legislature has the power to pass resolutions on any matter or move motions to censure a particular minister or the government as a whole. The most important motions are call-attention motion, adjournment motion, privilege motion and the no-confidence motion. A resolution is only meant to be recommendatory whereas censure motions, if passed, make it compulsory for the government to resign.

Questions

In a parliamentary form of government, legislative questions become the most continuous and vocal method of the people's representatives to exercise their scrutiny over the acts of omission and commission of the government. During the question hour in parliament any member can ask any question seeking information on any matter. The minister concerned, replies to these questions with the aid of the bureaucrats and secretaries in his department. If the answer given to a question does not satisfy the questioner, supplementary questions can also be asked to which ministers

are expected to give satisfactory replies. The main purpose of the question hour is to ventilate public grievances and to draw the attention of the people towards various facilities of the government. Since the questions may cover any field or branch of administration, the public officials are constantly alert, conscientious and responsible for their official acts.

Budgetary Control

In every democratic country, the legislature controls the nation's purse-strings. No money can be spent by the executive without legislative sanction. The budget proposals are extensively debated in parliament before being voted upon. With the ruling party enjoying a majority in parliament, in parliamentary democracies the demand for grants can neither be rejected nor reduced, but provides an opportunity for a general review of public policy. It is also the duty of the parliament to see that the money sanctioned has been spent economically and in accordance with the guidelines laid down by it. This requires proper audit of governmental expenditure which is the duty of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India. The Auditor General while auditing the governmental expenditure examines whether the money spent had legislative sanction and whether it was spent for the purpose for which sanction was made. It also examines governmental expenditure from the principles of economy and financial propriety.

Parliamentary Committees

Modern parliaments are so overburdened with work that they neither have the time nor technical expertise or knowledge to go into the details of the working of various administrative agencies and governmental departments. Thus the parliamentary committee system was evolved to act as a watchdog on public administration and governmental functioning. Some of the important committees of Parliament in India are : Public Accounts Committee, Estimates Committee, Committee on Public Undertakings, Committee on Subordinate Legislation and so on.

The Public Accounts Committee examines the report of the Auditor-General regarding the propriety of expenditure incurred by government departments. The Estimates Committee examines the budgetary estimates sent by different ministries to suggest economies in expenditure.

The Public Undertakings Committee is responsible for scrutinizing the reports and accounts of the public sector undertakings in India to see whether they are being managed in accordance with sound business principles.

The main purpose of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation is to exercise a necessary check over delegated legislation which is a typical legislative outgrowth of modern parliamentary

procedure, the courts have a right to pronounce on the legality of his action.

With the increase in power, number and functions of administrative bodies the rights of citizens are also protected by the quasi-judicial tribunals which exist in most democratic countries.

Judicial Remedies for Lawsuits Against Government and Officials

Judicial intervention can be in the form of suing the government itself or the public official concerned against whom any citizen may want a redressal of his grievance. The position regarding the suability of the government and public officials differs in the countries following the system of Rule of Law from those following the Administrative Law. The Rule of Law system prevails in England, the USA and most Commonwealth countries including India. The Administrative Law system is practised in France and some countries of Europe.

The Rule of Law system establishes that the public officials are subject to the ordinary laws of the land and cannot seek official protection for acts performed in their official capacity for which they are personally liable or suable in courts. However, there are always certain high officials who enjoy legal immunity for official acts in all countries like the British Monarch, the American President, the President of India and Governors of Indian States. The suability of the state in India is governed by Article 300 of the Constitution, which clearly states that the state is suable for contracts, that is, trading functions and is not suable for the tortuous acts of its officials. In practice, however, the state is often held responsible for the illegal acts of its public officials.

On the other hand, in the countries where the system of Administrative Law prevails, the state is liable and suable for all illegal acts of its officials. The errant officials in these countries are tried not in ordinary courts but in the administrative courts which have the powers to award damages from the public funds to the aggrieved parties.

Extraordinary Judicial Remedies in India

The courts in India have also been constitutionally provided with a number of writs which may be used by them to protect citizens' rights against arbitrary violation by the Government or public officials.

Habeas corpus : Habeas corpus, which literally means "to produce the body of" is a prerogative writ meant to provide immediate relief from arbitrary confinement or restraint and is issued for the vindication of the individual right to personal liberty by scrutinizing the legality of the confinement by the court. It is an obligatory power of the courts to issue this writ if there is a prima

facie case for supposing that the person detained is unlawfully deprived of his right to liberty. The writ will normally be issued if the court feels satisfied that the detention has not been made in accordance with the procedure established by law (Article 21 and 22) and the person detained has not been produced before the magistrate, within twenty-four hours of his arrest. However, the Preventive Detention Act in India, restricts the overall merit of this writ to a great extent. But even this Act has been hedged in with certain safeguards to prevent its arbitrary use. A person cannot be detained for a period of more than three months unless the cause of detention is investigated by an advisory board consisting of persons of the status of a judge of a High Court within that period and the board has upheld the cause of such detention.

Mandamus : The writ of mandamus is a command issued by a common law court of competent jurisdiction directing any person, corporation or inferior court requiring him or them to do some particular thing specified therein which concerns to this or their office and is in the nature of public duty. This writ cannot be claimed, as a matter of right and its issuance is entirely optional and discretionary by the courts. It is a writ issued to a public official to perform an official duty which he has failed to do. Normally, the writ is not issued, unless there is an alternative remedy which is self-sufficient, beneficial and effective.

Prohibition : Prohibition is a judicial writ issued by a higher to a lower court for preventing it from usurping jurisdiction which it has not been legally vested with. The writ thus commands the lower court not to exercise its power and authority over a matter which is not in its sphere of jurisdiction. This writ can be claimed as a matter of right and can be issued only against judicial and quasi-judicial tribunals.

Certiorari : The writ of *certiorari* means the direction of a superior court to an inferior court for transferring the records of proceedings of a case pending with it for the purpose of determining the legality of the proceedings and for giving more satisfactory effect to them than could be done in the inferior court concerned. The writ can be made available to adjudicate upon the validity of judicial decisions.

This writ usually upholds or nullifies the judgement of the inferior court.

Quo warranto : The literal meaning of the word "quo warranto" means "what warranty or authority". The writ of quo warranto is issued by the court to enquire into the legality of the claim which a party asserts to a permanent public office or franchise and to remove him from the post if his claim is found to be illegal. The burden of proof to prove his claim lies on the respondent.

It is now clear that the writs discussed above are in the nature of judicial control over judicial as well as administrative acts. The Supreme Court in India has been empowered under the Constitution to issue directions, writs and orders in the nature of habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibition, quo warranto and certiorari for the enforcement of the fundamental rights of the Indian citizens and the High Courts have been empowered within their jurisdiction to issue directions, orders or writs for the enforcement of fundamental rights and for any other purpose. Thus, it would be observed that the powers of High Courts are wider to the extent that besides issuing writs they can also issue other directions and orders as may be found necessary not only for the enforcement of fundamental rights but also for any other purpose.

Limitation of Judicial Control

Judicial remedies are no doubt a great bulwark of individual rights and liberties but they are also hedged in with certain limitations which often restrict their general usefulness. Firstly, all administrative actions are not subject to judicial control. Secondly, even within their sphere of jurisdiction, the judiciary cannot intervene on its own but can intervene only on the request of injured parties who may or may not choose to seek judicial redress. A large fraction of cases of administrative excesses do not even come before the courts because the judicial process being slow, cumbersome and expensive many do not like to take advantage of judicial remedies even though they may be aware of them.

Corruption

The problem of administrative corruption is perhaps as old as administration itself, but the problem of public accountability is as old as the theory and practice of democratic administration. The enormous expansion of the governmental bureaucracy, both in size and range, touching on all aspects of the citizen's life, has brought the problem of effective public checks and control on public administration to the forefront. The adoption of the goals of a social welfare state in almost all developing countries has resulted in an extension of bureaucracy in size and number. The expansion of governmental tasks results in the multiplication of the volume of work where administrative power and discretion are vested at different levels of the governmental hierarchy. And where there is power and discretion, there is always the possibility of abuse, more so when the power and discretion have to be exercised in the "context of scarcity and controls and pressure to spend public money, as in India", says Mohit Bhattacharya.

The Law Commission had pointed out in its fourteenth report that there is a vast sphere of administrative action in India in which the bureaucracy can exercise discretionary authority without being accountable to citizens in any way in case of abuse of authority.

Statutory powers have been given to all types of bureaucrats with ample scope for harassment, corruption and indulgence in malpractices by the errant few who may choose to do so. The increase in the scope and direction of governmental powers has been accompanied by an increase in the volume of legislation and executive orders in their extension to new areas.

Besides an increase in discretionary powers and delegated legislation, there has also been a phenomenal rise in the amount of administrative adjudication. The number of administrative tribunals has rapidly multiplied. As 'dispensers of justice' administrative tribunals have many plus points like speedy disposal of cases, freedom from the bounds of purely technical rules and consequent ability to give effect to legislatively expressed policy. Judgements of these tribunals are not ordinarily open to review by law courts except on procedural grounds like excess of jurisdiction and bias or error.

All the above problems—executive discretion, delegated legislation and administrative adjudication—are vitally connected with the problem of public accountability of administration. The problem of administrative malpractices is universal, though of more pressing importance in countries like India, with its history of colonial rule, and an unresponsive, authoritarian administrative culture. In the democracies of the West, there are many informal agencies of public control over administration like political parties, pressure groups, press and public opinion which by their vigilance and initiative can manage to exert a powerful influence and act as a check against administrative excesses.

Due to widespread illiteracy, ignorance of bureaucratic norms and procedures and retrogressive colonial legacies these informal agencies are very weak in India.

Administrative malpractices may take many forms. Numerous are the forms of corruption and abuse of authority in India. The Central Vigilance Commission has identified the following modes of corruption:

1. Misappropriation of public money and stores.

2. Possession of disproportionate assets.

3. Abuse of official position/powers.

4. Acceptance of illegal gratification in recruitments, postings, transfers and promotions.

5. Acceptance of gifts.

6. Misuse of imported and allotted quotas by various firms with the connivance of public servants.

7. Moral turpitude.

8. Unauthorized occupation and subletting of government quarters.

9. Under-assessment of income tax and estate duty for pecuniary gain.

10. Showing favours to contractors and firms.

11. Claiming of false travelling allowance and house rent.

12. Purchase of immovable property without prior permission or intimation.

13. Misuse of government employees for personal work.

14. Production of forged certificates of age or birth or community.

15. Acceptance of substandard stores/works.

16. Borrowing money from contractors/firms having official dealings with officers.

17. Incurring pecuniary obligations of persons with whom the public servants have official dealings.

18. Causing loss to government by negligence or otherwise.

19. Irregularities in the reservation of seats by rail and by air.

20. Non-delivery of money orders, insured covers, and value payable pracels.

21. Irregularity in grant of import and export licences.

22. Irregularity in the grant of telephone connections.

23. Misuse of advances sanctioned for purchase of scooters and cars.

24. Abnormal delay in settlement of compensation claims to displaced persons.

25. Wrong assessment of claims of displaced persons.

26. Cheating in connection with the sale and purchase of plots for residential purposes.[16]

Institutional Devices to Combat Administrative Excesses

Administrative Courts : The French system of administrative courts to deal with disputes between the administration and individual citizens is a unique device that has also been adopted

16. A. Awasthi and S. Maheshwari, *Public Administration*, Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, Agra, 1984, pp. 417-418.

by other countries like Greece, Belgium and Turkey. A distinction is made between acts which a government servant performs in his personal and those in his official capacity. For the latter type of acts he can be sued in the administrative courts. The members of the courts are civil servants with thorough knowledge of the administrative processes. The administrative courts exercise general supervision over administration and possess ultimate authority over all disciplinary matters concering civil servants.

The operational procedure of these courts is very simple. The plaintiff has to submit two copies of complaints, a copy of the contested decision, and an abstract of the legal arguments or factual details in support of the case. The court makes preliminary inquiries and invites the administrator concerned to justify his decision or action. The court can then take action on two grounds. It can either annul the administrative act or decision on grounds of legality or can recognise the existence of a fundamental or legal right which the administration has violated and ensure appropriate redress. Decisions in these courts are taken as promptly as possible and are much less expensive than in the ordinary courts. The gradual spread of this French institution to many other countries is a growing proof of its efficacy and popularity as a device for prompt redressal of citizen grievances.

The Procurator : The procurator system which originated in the USSR has now spread to many other countries of East Europe like Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. It is an important institution for redressing citizens' grievances and ensuring observance of legality at all levels of the administration. The procurator is in charge of multiple functions including the prosecution for crimes, supervision over legality in the activity of the investigating agencies, judicial sentences and judgements, and legality of the execution of sentences. However, its most significant function is that of 'general supervision', a two-fold task consisting of supervision over :

(a) conformity of the subordinate, legislation of ministries and other governmental agencies with various higher laws and decrees; and

(b) the strict implementation of laws by officials and citizens. Article 113 of the Russian Constitution gives a general mandate to the Procurator's Office to prevent Soviet governmental bodies from exceeding their powers. An individual citizen has the right to make a complaint to the procurator. Where available administrative or judicial procedure is yet to be made use of by the complainant, the procurator may take either of the following steps:

(i) It may advise the complainant to avail of the ordinary administrative or judicial channel.

(ii) It may itself initiate administrative or judicial proceedings in cases where the procurator has been given necessary authorisation.

(iii) It may take action on the subject of the complaint and directly address the organ against which the complaint has been made. The action by the procurator can take the form of a "protest" or "proposal" to rectify the violation of law or an initiation of proceedings against errant officials. It has been found to be a useful and effective device for redressal of citizens' grievances in the socialist countries.

The Ombudsman : A typical Scandinavian institution for redressing citizens' grievances, which has aroused worldwide interest, is the institution of Ombudsman. It has been adopted in North European countries such as Finland and Norway. Although the political systems of these countries may vary, they have a common interest in the democratization of public administration and finding ways and means for establishing an effective system of public accountability and control over the administrative apparatus at all levels. The Ombudsman is established as an instrument of parliament for the supervision and control of the administration. He, however, functions independently (a constitutional post) of the government and parliament in the performance of his duties. Parliament is, however, entitled to define and demarcate its sphere of authority. Ombudsman, a Swedish word, stands for an officer appointed by the legislature to handle complaints against administrative and judicial action. The investigations of the Ombudsman are conducted informally. In investigating complaints, the Ombudsman has free access to all the files of the administration and can demand explanations from the officials or authorities concerned.

In his capacity as Commissioner of Parliament the Ombudsman supervises the observance of law and statutes. He can investigate all cases of administrative malpractices and improper use of authority. He investigates complaints against administrative decisions or actions as well as complaints of official high-handedness, inefficiency or negligence. His work is carried out in the following ways :

1. Proposals for reform of administrative procedures and operations.

2. Directions or orders suggesting punitive action to be taken against officials.

3. Notification or report in case of giving notification or reporting upon defects in existing legislation to the minister concerned or to the houses of parliament.

The Ombudsman system has gained widespread popularity primarily because it is a speedy and cheap method of handling appeals against administrative decisions. It is not only an instrument for supervising the administration, but also an instrument for protection of citizens' rights. The prestige that traditionally goes with the office and the objectivity and competence of the Ombudsman have contributed to the legitimization of the institution and its worldwide acceptance.

The Indian Response

In India the need for institutional devices to deal with cases of administrative corruption and citizens' grievances have been recommended from time to time by committees and commissions to bring about new forms of public accountability of administration. The Santhanam Committee on Prevention of Corruption (1964) thought it necessary to devise adequate methods of control over exercise of discretion by different categories of government servants. As a sequel to the Santhanam Committee Report, vigilance commissions were set up at the Centre in 1964, and in the various states later. Vigilance cells have been created in several government departments and public sector undertakings.

The Central Vigilance Commission is headed by the Central Vigilance Commissioner appointed by the President of India. The Commission receives complaints directly from aggrieved persons. Other sources of information about corruption and malpractices are the press reports, audit reports and allegations made by members of Parliament. On receiving complaints, the commission may ask

(i) the concerned ministry/department to inquire into them;

(ii) the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) to make an inquiry; and

(iii) the CBI director to register a case and conduct an investigation. Prosecution, however, depends on the approval of the appropriate sanctioning authority.

The jurisdiction of the Commission is presently limited to complaints against gazetted officers and officers of equivalent status.

The Administrative Reforms Commission set up in 1966 took up on priority basis the matter of redressing citizens' grievances. The Commission felt that the existing institutions to deal with this problem were inadequate and found the institution of Ombudsman a *sine qua non* of democratic functioning and (as) an essential prerequisite of the progress and prosperity on which the fulfilment of our democracy depends.

The Lokpal Bill in India

On August 12, 1985, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs disclosed the Government's intention to bring forward legislation providing for the appointment of a Lokpal to handle corruption cases against top public servants. The measure is designed to cleanse public life by ending corruption in high places. This is the fourth time that legislation for creating an Ombudsman-type institution has been taken up since the introduction of the first measure for this purpose in 1968.

The main features of the Lokpal Bill are : Complaints alleging offences under the Prevention of Corruption Act or Chapter IX of the Indian Penal Code (offences relating to public servants) will be inquired into by the Lokpal. Complaints can only be against (i) a Union Minister (except the Prime Minister), including a Deputy Minister or a Parliamentary Secretary; Chief Minister of a State and Union Territory. Every complaint will be accompanied by an affidavit and a security deposit of Rs. 1,000. The Lokpal will be appointed in consultation with the Chief Justice of India. He will be either a serving or a retired Supreme Court Judge or a person eligible to be appointed a Supreme Court Judge.

The Lokpal can dismiss a complaint if it is frivolous or pertains to an alleged offence committed five years prior to the date of complaint. After inquiry, the Lokpal will submit his report to the Prime Minister, in the case of Union Ministers, and to the Chief Minister where the complaint is against his ministers. Action on the report is to be taken within three months of its submission and the Lokpal has to be informed about it. If the Lokpal is not satisfied with the action taken, he can submit a special report. The Lokpal is also to give an annual report on his functions. These reports are to be placed before the Parliament. Either the special report or the extract of an annual report concerning a complaint against a Chief Minister is to be placed before the legislature of the State or the Union Territory concerned. The public prosecutor will file a complaint before the competent court when any person insults or interferes with the work of the Lokpal. If false evidence is given before him or the Lokpal finds that the complaint is malicious, the Lok Pal can convict and sentence the accused person.

The President, the Vice-President, the Prime Minister, the Lok Sabha Speaker and all members of parliament are kept out of the purview of the Bill. Leaders of all groups represented in both the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha felt that the Prime Minister should not be excluded.

In view of the subsequent controversy, the Union Government changed its plans at the last minute and agreed on August 28 to

the suggestion to refer the Bill to a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament.

This is the fourth time in nineteen years that the Bill has been referred to a Joint Select Committee. On each of the three occasions, in 1966, 1971 and 1977, the House of the People or the Lok Sabha, was dissolved before the Committee could report to the two Houses.

The committee will comprise 45 members—30 from the Lok Sabha and 15 from the Rajya Sabha. The Speaker, Mr. Balram Jakhar, said the Bill required greater consideration and that both the Government and the Opposition were agreed that it should be referred to a Joint Select Committee. The Bill is under the consideration of the committee.

The measure is, of course, to be welcomed as another major step to check corruption. Whether the Lokpal would be an effective functionary and whether the vast-ranging, deep-rooted corruption would be checked or minimised remains to be seen. There are several imponderables.

To sum up, the institutional devices of public accountability and for redressing citizens' grievances in India are many and varied (legislative, administrative and judicial). Several institutions at the central, state and local levels exist for this purpose but they merely touch the tip of the iceberg of administrative corruption. Dissatisfaction with governmental functioning and behaviour of employees is widespread. It is against the background of bureaucratic inefficiency and general illiteracy and apathy of the masses at large that the usefulness of Ombudsman or any other grievance handling machinery should be considered. The Ombudsman type of institution presupposes a fair measure of administrative efficiency so that most cases of citizens are attended to promptly, first by the regular machineries such as administrative agencies and then the judiciary. But where the normal functioning of the administrative machinery is inertia-ridden and corrupt, the Ombudsman is likely to be swamped with overwork. As the Administrative Reforms Commission has pointed out,

> The setting up of these authorities is not the complete answer to the problem of redress of citizens' grievances. They only provide the ultimate setup for such redress as has not been available through the normal departmental governmental machinery and do not absolve the department from fulfilling its obligations to the citizen for administering its affairs without generating, as far as possible, any legitimate sense of grievance.

In the ultimate analysis, it has been pointed out that an efficient and clean system of administration is the by-product of a

similar political and administrative culture. In a democratic system, administrative leadership belongs to the politicians who are the representatives of the people. In the present Indian environment of falling standards of political morality, and administrative corruption, institutional devices to check administrative malpractices will not really grow and flourish because they cannot become independent of the overwhelming bureaucratic apparatus of the government and the overpowering political forces at work around them.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Afanasyev, V.G., *The Scientific Management of Society*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1971.

Albrow, Martin, *Bureaucracy*, London, Pall Mall, 1970.

Ali, Shum Sun Nisa, *Eminent Administrative Thinkers*, New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1984.

Appleby, Paul H., *Policy and Administration*, Alabama, University of Alabama Press, 1957.

Awasthi A,, and Arora, Ramesh K. (ed.). *Bureaucracy and Development: Indian Perspectives*, New Delhi, Associated Publishing House, 1978.

Avasthi A. and Maheshwari S., *Public Administration*, Agra, Lakshmi Narain Agarwal, 1984.

Barnett, A. Doak, *Cadres, Bureaucracy and Political Power in Communist China*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1967.

Bava, Noorjahan, *People's Participation in Development Administration in India*, New Delhi, Uppal Publishing House, 1984.

Bhalerao, C.N. (ed.). *Administration, Politics and Development in India*, Bombay, Lalwani Publishing House, 1972.

Bhambhri, C.P., *Administration in a Changing Society*, Delhi, National Publishing House, 1972.

———, *Bureaucracy and Politics in India*, Delhi, Vikas, 1971.

Bhattacharya, Mohit, *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, New Delhi, Uppal Publishing House, 1979.

———, *Public Administration*, Calcutta, World Press, 1981.

Caiden, Gerald E., *Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1971.

Crozier, Michel, *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Dimock, Marshall E., Dimock, Gladys O., Koeing, Lonis W., *Public Administration*, Rinehart and Co. Inc., 1959.

Dwivedi, O.P. and Jain, R.B., *India's Administrative State*, New Delhi, Gitanjali Publishing House, 1985.

Eldersveld, S.J., Barnabas, A.P. and Jagannadham (eds.), *The Citizen and the Administration in a Developing Democracy, An Empirical Study*, I.I.P.A., New Delhi, 1968.

Gladden, E.N., *History of Public Administration*, London, Frank Cass, 1972.

Golembiewski, R.T. (ed.), *Public Administration, Readings in Institutions, Processes, Behaviour*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1966.

Gross, Bertram, *Organizations and Their Managing*, New York, Free Press, 1968.

Heady, Ferrel, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc., 1966.

Henry, Nicholas, *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1975.

Hough, Jerry F. and Fainsod, Merle, *How the Soviet Union is Governed*, Cambridge, M.I.T.. Harvard University Press, 1979.

Jain, R.B., *Contemporary Issues in Indian Administration*, Delhi, Vishal Publishers, 1976.

La Palombara, Joseph, *Bureaucracy and Political Development*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963.

Lindblom, C.E., *The Policy Making Process*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1968.

Marx, Fritz Morstein, *Elements of Public Administration*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1963.

Nigro, Felix A., *Modern Public Administration*, New York, Harper and Row, 1970.

Panandikar, V.A. Pai, and Kshirsagar, S.S. (eds.), *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, New Delhi, Centre for Policy Research, 1978.

Pfiffner, John M.. and Presthus, R. Vance, *Public Administration*, New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1960.

Riggs, Fred W., *The Ecology of Public Administration*, Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1961.

————(ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration*, North Carolina Duke University Press, Dunham, 1970.

Schapiro, Leonard, *The Government and Politics of the Soviet Union*, London, Hutchinson University Library, 1970.

Self, Peter, *Administrative Theories and Politics, An Enquiry into the Structure and Process of Modern Government*, New Delhi, S. Chand and Company, 1984.

Sharan, Parmatma, *Modern Public Administration*, Meerut, Meenakshi Prakashan, 1981.

Sharkansky, Ira, *Public Administration, Policy Making in Government Agencies*, Chicago, Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978.

Smith, Gordon, *Public Policy and Administration in Soviet Union*, New York, Praeger, 1980.

Swerdlow, Irving, *Development Administration, Concepts and Problems*, New York, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1983.

Thavaraj, M.J.K., *Financial Administration in India*, New Delhi, Sultan Chand, 1978.

Tyagi, A.R., *Public Administration*, Delhi, Atma Ram and Sons, 1975.

Varlamov, K., *Socialist Management, The Leninist Concept*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1977.

Waldo, Dwight, *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration*, New York, McGraw Hill, 1953.

Wang, James C.F., *Contemporary Chinese Politics*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, 1980.

White, L.D., *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, New York, Macmillan, 1958.

INDEX

INDEX